COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. VII. No. 23.] LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE, 8, 1805. [PRICE 1OD.

"Where the supreme authority, not content with winking at the rapacity of its inferior instruments, is so "shameless and corrupt as openly to give bounties and premiums for disobedience to its laws; when it will "not trust to the activity of avarice in the pursuit of its own gains; when it secures public robbery by all "the careful jealousy and attention, with which it ought to protect property from such violence; the com- "monwealth then is become totally perverted from its purposes; neither God nor man will long endure it; "nor will it long endure itself; for, in that case, there is an unnatural infection, a pestilential taint ferment- "ing in the constitution of society, which fever and convulsions of some kind or other must throw off." ——BURKE. Speech on the Nabob of Arcot's Debts, 28 Feb. 1785.

LORD MELVILLE & MR. PITT'S CONDUCT.

The Report of the Select Committee, upon the matters relating to the conduct of Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt, was laid before the House of Commons on the 27th ultimo: it has since been printed by order of that House, and is now published for the information of the people.——The *Report* of any committee, appointed for a purpose like the present, is, comparatively, of little importance, when the whole of the minutes of the *Evidence* accompany it, the report itself being merely a *summary* of the evidence. It is, indeed, something of the nature of the *summing up* of a judge, at the close of an examination; but, it is less necessary, because the jury have no minutes of the evidence, which, in the present instance, we have: and, if the summing up, and explanations of a report of a committee may, in any case, be dispensed with, they surely may in this case; especially when we recollect all the circumstances, under which the committee *was formed*.——The *evidence*, therefore, or, at least, as much of it as I have room for, and all of it that is very material, I am now about to insert; and, to *every part* of it, I beg leave to beseech the attention of the reader, reminding him, at the same time, that, in order clearly to understand, and justly to decide upon, the case of either of the persons, who now stand accused before him, he must keep in his view the whole history of the prosecution, from the first examination of Trotter to the notice of the motion to be made next Tuesday by Mr. Whitbread. He must bear in mind, that it was in May, 1804, that Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt turned out the Addingtons, loading them with every species of reproach and contempt; that soon afterwards, June, 1804, Mr. Trotter was first examined by the Naval Commissioners; that Lord Melville was written to by those Commissioners in June, 1804, and was examined by them on the 5th of November, 1804; that *almost immediately after that examination* a coalition took place between the Addingtons and Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt, which coalition *Mr. Pitt himself solicited* by means of a letter conveyed to Mr. Henry Addington through Lord Hawkesbury; that this junction, so formed, so sought for, so humbly solicited, by Mr. Pitt, with persons whom he had turned out under the charge, openly and distinctly made, of "*incapacity* and *imbecillity*," excited very great and general surprise, and was never satisfactorily accounted for, till the Tenth Report of the Naval Commissioners discovered in how great need Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville might stand of friendly comfort. When the reader has thus refreshed his memory as to the occurrences preceding the printing of the Tenth Report, let him look back to the conduct of Mr. Pitt previous to the discussion of the 8th of April, when the resolution of censure upon Lord Melville was passed; let him not forget that it was Mr. Pitt who brought forward the proposition for receiving the Letter, which Lord Melville wrote to the Naval Commissioners after the printing of the Tenth Report; let him not forget, that it was Mr. Pitt, who disputed the ground, inch by inch, for Lord Melville on the 8th of April, after he had read, over and over again, the proofs of Lord Melville's conduct; let him not forget, that it was Mr. Pitt, who opposed, on the 10th of April, the motion for an address to the King to remove Lord Melville from the privy council, and that, at a subsequent period, he notified to the House that he had advised the King to dismiss his Lordship, because he *had learnt that the House wished it*, and because he was convinced, that any attempt on his part to prevent an address to the King would prove abortive. Let the reader not forget these things; and, let him remember, moreover, that when a motion was made for the purpose of forming a SELECT COMMITTEE to inquire further into the matters brought to light by the Tenth Report, that Mr. Pitt moved and carried an amendment, *so restraining the powers* of the said committee as to render it very difficult for

them to touch upon any point, calculated further to develope the transactions between Lord Melville and Mr. Trotter.——As to the case of Mr. Pitt himself, let it be remembered, that, though Lord Melville was the man who drew up the law, which has now been violated, it was Mr. Pitt who *caused* it to be drawn up; it was Mr. Pitt who introduced it to the House of Commons; it was Mr. Pitt who boasted, who bragged, of its salutary tendency; it was Mr. Pitt who explained its meaning, and who promised the Commons, that, in future, all the naval money *would lie at the Bank of England till the very moment it was wanted for the service of the navy.* Let this important fact be kept in mind, while the reader is going through the evidence of Mr. Pitt, Mr. Raikes, and Lord Harrowby; and, I beg him to mark well the *language* of the answers of all these persons, as well, indeed, as of all the others that were examined.——As to the Committee, when the reader recollects how it was formed and composed; when he recollects, that it was formed by ballot, that is to say, by lists sent round to the members, whereby he who has a majority in the House is sure to have whatever members he chooses upon the committee; when the reader recollects this, and observes, besides, who were the persons composing a majority of the committee, he will be satisfied, that there has been, on the part of the committee, no partiality shown against Mr. Pitt and his illustrious friend.——The heads, under which the subject divides itself are THREE; to wit; 1. The *participation of Lord Melville with Trotter* in the profits made by an unlawful use of the naval money: 2. Mr. Pitt's conniving at the withdrawing of naval money from the Bank, and his unlawfully lending a large sum of the said money, to two loan jobbers, named Boyd and Benfield, the latter of whom is the famous Paul Benfield, whose memorable transactions, in the years 1784 and 1785, are recorded in Mr. Burke's Speech upon the debts of the Nabob of Arcot: 3. Mr. Pitt's conniving at the withdrawing of naval money from the Bank of England to be lodged at the banking House of Coutts and Company, and, of course, to be made use of for purposes of private emolument.——These are the THREE HEADS, to one or the other of which all the evidence I am now about to lay before the reader will be found to relate. He should keep them as distinct as possible in his mind. He will find the evidence a good deal mixed, of course; but, though I shall scarcely refrain from subjoining some few observations, I cannot help expressing my firm conviction, that nothing more will be necessary than a sober and impartial perusal of the evidence itself, as here given by me. The *whole*, however, must be read. It must be read, too, with care, and without losing sight, for one moment, of the circumstances above pointed out. When the reader has taken a few minutes to refresh his memory as to those circumstances, let him sit down to the perusal; and, above all things, let him first banish from his mind every *party* propensity. He, doubtless, will, and he ought, to remember, that *my* fixed opinion is, that Mr. Pitt's system of administration is hostile to the well-being of England; and, of course, that I earnestly wish to see that gentleman no longer in power; but, I trust, that no one will impute to me a desire so base as that of seeing him sink undeservedly covered with the infamous charge of having connived at peculation, of having winked at the plundering of the people and the sovereign, who had confided to his hands the guardianship of their treasure. It is difficult, when the temptation presents itself, to avoid taking advantage of circumstances favouring one's views of general hostility; and, therefore, though, during the whole of the discussions connected with this subject, I have endeavoured to detach my mind from all extraneous considerations, any reader, who may happen to place, generally, reliance upon my opinions, will, in this particular instance, do well to be upon his guard against them. Indeed, my *opinions* ought here to have no weight with him. It is the *fact* and the *reasoning:* these cannot be affected by the source whence they proceed; and if in these there be found no ground to condemn Mr. Pitt, I ought to wish, and I hope I do not deceive myself in declaring that I sincerely wish, that he may stand clearly acquitted in the eyes of all mankind.

EVIDENCE,

Reported to the House of Commons, on the 27th of May, 1805, by the SELECT COMMITTEE, appointed to examine into certain matters brought to light in the Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry, relative to the conduct of

LORD MELVILLE & MR. PITT.

EXAMINATION OF ALEXANDER TROTTER (LATE PAYMASTER OF THE NAVY), ON THE 3D, 4TH, 6TH, 7TH, 9TH, 10TH, 23D, AND 27TH OF MAY, 1805.

3d of May.——*Q.* State to the committee what sums were applied to services not naval, of the monies issued for the service of the navy under the treasurership of

Lord Melville, to what amount, and at what time? *A.* Lord Melville never gave me any information upon the application of monies issued under such circumstances, and I only judge of the sum alluded to having been applied to other services, from the circumstance of its having been returned by a person acting in another department of government.—*Q.* What was that sum? *A.* 40,000l. as far as I am informed; it was not issued by me.——*Q.* By whom was it issued? *A.* I believe, by Mr. Wilson, who officiated for me during my absence, having been at that time in Scotland.——*Q.* What was the date of the issue? *A.* I am not enabled to inform you with any degree of accuracy, but I think it must have been some time between the middle of August and the end of October, in the year 1796.——*Q.* Was Mr. Wilson employed to transact business for you during your absence? *A.* He was in the habit of officiating for me, but not under any regular power, when I was absent from the office?——*Q.* By what authority or power could Mr. Wilson issue such 40,000l.? *A.* I left him in possession of drafts upon the Bank of England, signed by myself as attorney to the treasurer.——*Q.* Were those drafts filled up by yourself for certain sums, or your signature left to blanks in Mr. Wilson's possession? *A.* My signature was affixed to blanks left in Mr. Wilson's possession, and which I found necessary to carry on the business of the Pay Office, to prevent the accident, in case of my illness or occasional absence, of the cashiers making unexpected or sudden demands for the public service.——*Q.* Were the blanks for the names as well as the sums left? *A.* They were.——*Q.* Had you communications with Mr. Wilson during your absence, on the subject of the accounts of the Pay Office? *A.* I had.——*Q.* Are those communications preserved? *A.* They are not, as far as I know.——*Q.* What is become of them? *A.* Having closed the whole of this business in question, I did not think it at all necessary to preserve any part of the documents relating to it.——*Q.* What did you do with them? *A.* I looked upon them as papers of no consequence; and they must have been destroyed with other papers, which I may also have looked upon as papers of no consequence to be preserved.——*Q.* Are you sure they are not now in existence? *A.* I am positively certain; and that they never consisted, as far as I know, of more than letters which Mr. Wilson had written to me on the subject during my absence.——*Q.* When did you destroy them? *A.* I cannot recollect, but certainly more than one or two years ago; and I fancy in 1803, when I was out of office.——*Q.* On your return from your absences, did Mr. Wilson give you a regular account in writing of his transactions in the Navy Pay Office during such absences? *A.* No; he was not in the habit of doing so.——*Q.* How then could you see or come at the knowledge of what those transactions had been, or what the conduct of Mr. Wilson had been? *A.* I was informed of his transactions, as I have already said, by correspondence with him; and from his *very high character* and the *perfect confidence which I had in him*, I did not find it necessary to require more from him than verbal explanations upon any particular point of transactions which had taken place in my absence.——*Q.* Did Mr. Wilson keep any account-books or ledgers in which those transactions were registered? *A.* I do not believe *that any entry was made in any ledger of the transactions* which you have particularly alluded to.——*Q.* (Repeated.) *A.* He kept the public ledgers of the office in which all my public transactions have been regularly entered.—*Q.* Are those ledgers in existence? *A.* They are, and in the Navy Pay Office.——*Q.* Was the sum of 40,000l. alluded to by you as having been paid by Mr. Wilson for services not naval, in the year 1796, the only sum paid under the same circumstances of which you have any knowledge? *A.* It was, as far as I recollect.——*Q.* Did you never pay any sum or sums yourself by draft or notes, or payment of any description, into the hands of Lord Melville, or any person authorised by him, or on his account, of public money issued for naval services, for purposes not naval? *A.* I have already explained my difficulty to the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry, of discriminating between my public and private monies; and I have already declared to you, that *I did not know the application which Lord Melville may have made of advances which I may have occasionally made to his lordship.*——*Q.* (Repeated.) *A.* I presume I have.——*Q.* At what time and to what amount? *A.* My recollection does not enable me to answer that question.——*Q.* Were any entries made by you, or any person authorised by you, in any books or ledgers, or any memorandum kept of any description, of such payment? *A.* I kept regular accounts of all my money transactions with Lord Melville, but having closed and settled the whole of them, and a mutual release having passed between us, I have not thought it necessary to preserve any documents respecting my transactions with his lordship.—*Q.* Are those documents in existence? *A.* They are not, as far as I know.——*Q.* When were they

destroyed? *A.* At the time I was out of office; I think in 1803.——*Q.* Did you destroy them? *A.* I did; I burnt those I thought unnecessary to keep.——*Q.* Did those books or documents contain your accounts with any other persons besides my Lord Melville? *A.* They did.——*Q.* When was the release before-mentioned executed? *A.* In the year 1803, to the best of my recollection.——*Q.* When payments of the description above stated were made, were they always made to Lord Melville personally? *A.* Not always.——*Q.* Did you ever? *A.* I do not, at this moment, recollect I ever did.——*Q.* To whom did you ever pay, on Lord Melville's, account, public money for purposes not naval? *A.* I used *most frequently* to pay them into the hands of the principal money conductor, one of the officers of the Navy Pay Office.——*Q.* What was his name? *A.* Mr. Tweedy; he is now dead.——*Q.* What other persons did you make such payments to? *A.* I cannot recollect any other persons at this moment.——*Q.* How long has Mr. Tweedy been dead? *A.* Two or three years since Lord Melville's Treasurership ceased.——*Q.* To what other persons did you make such payments to? *A.* I do not recollect any other person.——*Q.* Was there any account kept between Mr. Tweedy and you? *A.* None.——*Q.* What was the nature of the discharge you received from Mr. Tweedy? *A.* I took no discharge.——*Q.* What authority did Mr. Tweedy produce to you for the payment of such money? *A.* The demand for such money had previously been made by Lord Melville to myself.——*Q.* Verbally, or in writing? *A.* Verbally.——*Q.* Did you keep any account of the sums paid to Mr. Tweedy, in consequence of such verbal demands of Lord Melville? *A.* I entered them in the accounts which I kept with his lordship.——*Q.* Are they in existence? *A.* I have already mentioned, that I had not thought it necessary to preserve any accounts between Lord Melville and myself, a mutual release having passed between us.——*Q.* Do you know the amount of any such sums which you may have paid to Mr. Tweedy? *A.* My recollection does not serve me to specify any such sums.——*Q.* Do you recollect any thing about the date of such payments? *A.* I do not.——*Q.* Do you recollect what sort of sums they may have been? *A.* Once or twice they may have amounted to between three or four thousand pounds, but not larger.——*Q.* In making such payments to Mr. Tweedy, did you consider him as a public officer, or a private agent of Lord Melville? *A.* I obeyed Lord Melville's directions in paying the money to him, without pretending to consider whether he was a private agent or not.——*Q.* Had you any public money transactions with Mr. Tweedy officially? *A.* I had.——*Q.* Where were those public official transactions recorded? *A.* In the Navy Pay Office.——*Q.* Are the payments to Mr. Tweedy, by Lord Melville's verbal order, recorded there also? *A.* They are not in any instance.——*Q.* Do you know into whose hands the 40,000*l.*, paid by Mr. Wilson during your absence in the year 1796, for purposes not naval, was placed? *A.* I only know from the information which Mr. Wilson has given me upon that subject.——*Q.* What was that information? *A.* That he had paid the money to Lord Melville.——*Q.* By whom, and at what time was that money returned? *A.* I have already stated in general terms, that I believe it to be returned by Mr. Long; but I can only speak with my own knowledge in respect to the last payment, which, as far as I can recollect, amounted to 6,000*l.*, and which was returned to me by Mr. Long some time in January, 1798.——*Q.* At what period or periods was the 34,000*l.* returned, and to whom? *A.* I have no further knowledge of the circumstance; as I was much in Scotland in the latter end of 1796 and in the year 1797, and the repayments were made, to the best of my knowledge, during my absence; but I am very certain that the 6,000*l.*, which I received in January, 1798, completed the full repayment of the 40,000*l.*——*Q.* Were any entries made in the office-books of such repayments? *A.* None that I know of.——*Q.* How then did you come to the conviction of the payment of 6,000*l.* in January, 1798, making the balance of the 40,000*l.* paid out as before stated in the year 1796? *A.* From a knowledge which I have at all times had of the state of my balances, by which I must have seen when any deficiency that may have existed was paid up.——*Q.* How came you then not to see the dates of the repayments of such 34,000*l.*? *A.* I make no doubt that I may have seen the dates, but I have no recollection of them whatever?——*Q.* Where were they recorded? *A.* In my own private books.——*Q.* Where are those books? *A.* They are the books before-mentioned, which I did not think necessary to preserve.——*Q.* Were the sums paid to Mr. Tweedy by Lord Melville's verbal order ever returned to you, or in any way repaid to the account of the public in the Navy Pay Office, or to any other fund? *A.* They have unquestionably been all repaid to me, and I have accounted for the whole of the money that has been put

under my charge for naval services.——*Q.* Did Lord Melville pay interest to you for such sums during the time they were in his possession? *A.* Lord Melville has paid me interest for sums of money, but not upon those which I have stated to have been paid to Mr. Tweedy.——*Q.* Who are Mr. Tweedy's executors? *A.* He left two sons, but whether they are his executors or not I do not know.——*Q.* Was any interest paid on the 40,000l. advanced during your absence by Mr. Wilson? *A.* None that I know of.——*Q.* Were the sums advanced to Mr. Tweedy advanced out of the mixed fund at Messrs. Coutts', or were they advanced out of a fund which consisted exclusively of public money? *A.* I do not recollect any other advances than those made out of the mixed fund at Messrs. Coutts'.——*Q.* What reason had you for considering that the 40,000l. was advanced out of public money? *A.* It was from a general impression which I received from the communications made to me upon this subject, and I do not know whether this 40,000l. was advanced from Messrs. Coutts' or not.——*Q.* What may have been the total amount of money, described to be advanced as different times to Mr. Tweedy by order of Lord Melville, as nearly as you can recollect? *A.* The total amount of monies of this description, to the best of my recollection, have never, in the whole, exceeded 30,000l. until the sum of 40,000l. was added to it; but I cannot state with certainty that the whole of the sums constituting that 30,000l. was advanced to Mr. Tweedy.——*Q.* To whom was any part of the 30,000l. advanced, which was not paid to Mr. Tweedy? *A.* I have already stated, that I do not recollect.——*Q.* Within what period of time did these issues take place? *A.* I mean to comprehend the whole time during which I acted as Paymaster under Lord Melville, for 14 or 15 years.——*Q.* Why did you destroy papers in which other persons' accounts were kept, as well as Lord Melville's? *A.* Because the whole of my accounts were closed upon my leaving London, excepting some private family concerns, and very small accounts between my friends and myself, which I carried forward into new books. I desire to state to my former answer, that 10,000l. of the 30,000l. had accrued before I was appointed to my office.—*Q.* By whom was the 10,000l. advanced? *A.* I do not know.——*Q.* How did you know the existence of such a debt? *A.* By Lord Melville's acknowledgment to me.——*Q.* To whom did he acknowledge himself debtor? *A.* To the office.——*Q.* Of how long standing had that debt been? *A.* I have no knowledge of the circumstance.——*Q.* To whom was that 10,000l. repaid? *A.* It must have been repaid to me.—*Q.* In what capacity did you receive that sum that you had never advanced? *A.* In capacity of paymaster.——*Q.* Did you then conceive it to be a debt due to the public? *A.* I did.——*Q.* Was any interest paid upon it? *A.* None.——*Q.* Had not Lord Melville made such acknowledgment, could you have traced such debt due from him to the public, in any of the office-books? *A.* I could certainly have told that the balance of the account put under my charge was so much deficient.——*Q.* Was Lord Melville debited for such sum in any of the books? *A.* He was not.——*Q.* What was the nature of the acknowledgment of Lord Melville? *A.* Merely verbal.——*Q.* Did you conceive Mr. Tweedy acting as a private agent for Lord Melville, or ever acting for him in that capacity? *A.* I consider him, in these instances, to have been acting for his lordship in a private capacity.——*Q.* Explain private? *A.* Merely as a person sent to me by his lordship to receive the money which I had previously been directed to pay to him.——*Q.* Were those directions from Lord Melville to procure money generally, or to procure him public money? *A.* To procure money generally.——*Q.* Did you consider Mr. Tweedy merely as a messenger to carry the money to Lord Melville, or concerned in the application of the money? *A.* Merely as a messenger.

4th May.——*Q.* Of the sums you have advanced from time to time to Lord Melville, not exceeding the 20,000l., as mentioned yesterday, do you know whether any part of it was applied to any public purpose? *A.* I do not, but I beg to be understood, that this sum which I mentioned yesterday, is not connected with the sums which I have mentioned before the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry to have been occasionally in advance to Lord Melville, and for which I accounted his lordship my private debtor.——*Q.* In the Tenth Report it is mentioned, that a certain sum was left in Mr. Trotter's hands, as the balance of the first part of the second treasurership, where is that sum now, amounting to £5,484. 15. 3.? *A.* The greater part of it is still in my possession, but a small part has been paid away at one payment.——*Q.* What was the amount of the small payment? *A.* I issued two hundred pounds to the cashier to make payment of a larger demand, assisted by money in the cashier's hands.——*Q.* When was that payment made? *A.* It was made in December, 1804, and I have taken measures within these two days to pay up the whole balance.

——*Q.* What are the measures you have taken? *A.* I have inquired into the amount of balances remaining unassigned in that treasurership, with a view to procure assignments being made so as to reduce the balance. ——*Q.* To whom do you propose to pay the balance, when it is so reduced? *A.* The account being nearly closed, I expect directions from the Auditor's Office to pay the balance into the Exchequer.——*Q.* What obstacles have there been in the way to an earlier settlement of this account? *A.* From the peculiarly intricate manner in which the account of the ex-treasurers are required to be closed, but which intricacy arises from the minute accuracy which is observed.—— *Q.* There is a certain sum mentioned in the 135th page of the Tenth Report of the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry, of the sum of £5,563. 6. 2¼. which was paid into Lord Melville's own hands in May or June, 1800, which was the balance of Lord Melville's first treasurership, ending in 1783; do you know where that sum now is? *A.* I do not, any further than I have heard Lord Melville, within these three weeks or a month, say, that he meant to pay it immediately into the Exchequer.——*Q.* From the state of the accounts of Lord Melville's first treasurership, could that balance have been earlier paid into the Exchequer? *A.* I apprehend not until within these three or four months, until which time that account of his lordship had not been delivered to the auditors.——*Q.* Upon what does that depend, the delivery to the auditor? *A.* The final arrangement of the account, in the minute manner in which I have endeavoured to describe, in which the whole payments made in the treasurership are brought to agree in the account of the sums as certified to the several boards, with the accounts made up in a different form, and delivered to the auditors.——*Q.* Whether any of the payments which you had made to Mr. Tweedy, by Lord Melville's direction, had any relation to those circumstances which Lord Melville had confidently communicated to you, and which you did not deem yourself at liberty to relate, as mentioned in page 203 in the Tenth Report? *A.* I had no such allusion.——[The witness desires to amend his evidence of yesterday, as to sums advanced to other persons besides Mr. Tweedy, see page 19, 3d May—×—In looking at my banker's book, I find that I have occasionally made payments into the houses of Messrs. Drummond and Messrs. Coutts, and to my Lord Melville's secretary, Mr. Alves, and other members of his lordship's family.]—*Q.* Do you mean to say that all these payments, added to the payments made to Mr. Tweedy, do not exceed in the whole, and during the whole time of your acting as paymaster to Lord Melville, the sum of 20,000l.? *A.* Upon a further consideration of the sums which I stated yesterday, I should wish to add to that sum two or three thousand pounds.—*Q.* When did your private agency begin with Lord Melville? *A.* I do not recollect; I had no regular appointment as private agent.——*Q.* Were any acts of private agency performed by you for Lord Melville, previous to your appointment as Paymaster of the Navy? *A.* Not any.——*Q.* When did the private agency cease? *A.* It has not ceased.——*Q.* Have you performed any act of private agency since the execution of the releases in 1803? *A.* I have.——*Q.* What do you mean by members of Lord Melville's family? *A.* I mean his domestic servants. ——[The witness wishes to amend his answer of yesterday, in page 20, 3d May—×— I have already amended my evidence of yesterday, so far as to say, that I had made advances for Lord Melville to others besides Mr. Tweedy; and I have now further to amend my answer of yesterday, by saying, that some of those advances made to others than Mr. Tweedy, but constituting the sum as I said yesterday of 20,000l., and to which to-day I have added two or three thousand pounds, were advanced from funds exclusively of public money; and I wish in this to refer to my evidence given before the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry, in page 220, as an explanation to an answer that I then gave on that subject, and which, as I did not recollect at that time the circumstances now mentioned, was then perfectly correct; and I must further amend my evidence of yesterday by now saying, that I do not think Lord Melville gave me verbal, or any instructions, in some instances wherein I had advanced sums of money for his lordship to Mr. Tweedy.] —*Q.* Upon what authority then did you make such advances? *A.* I acted in those instances from my own judgment, in the management of his lordship's concerns.—— *Q.* You had at times verbal instructions from Lord Melville? *A.* Yes, I had.——*Q.* Of the sums advanced to Mr. Tweedy and others, for the use of Lord Melville, stated by you yesterday to amount to the sum of 20,000l. to which you have added a further sum of 2 or 3,000l. to day, can you now, upon recollection, state how much was public and how much private money? *A.* I have no means to enable me to state that circumstance with accuracy.——*Q.* Please to state it generally? *A.* As nearly as I can state it, about one-half public and one-half private.—*Q.* Do you mean to say one-half

exclusively public? *A.* I do.——*Q.* Do you mean the other half exclusively private? *A.* I mean the other half to have been principally advanced from my account at the house of Messrs. Coutts and Company.——*Q.* Of the advances from 10 to 20,000l. mentioned in the Tenth Report to have been made by you to Lord Melville at different times, have you now any means of judging what part was public and what private money? *A.* I believe the whole to have been advanced from my accounts at the house of Messrs. Coutts and Company.——*Q.* Was the interest always paid by Lord Melville to you on those advances? *A.* It was not.——*Q.* Was it ever paid? *A.* No; his lordship paid me no interest for those advances.——*Q.* What was it that induced you to exercise your judgment in making payments to Mr. Tweedy, without any direction from Lord Melville so to do; was it from any knowledge of the manner in which the monies so paid to Mr. Tweedy was to be applied on account of Lord Melville? *A.* I allude to private transactions in the management of Lord Melville's private business, in which I had general directions, although no specific directions on every occasion.——*Q.* Are the committee to understand that some of the payments made to Mr. Tweedy, on Lord Melville's account, were made to Mr. Tweedy as to a person who had the management of Lord Melville's private affairs? *A.* Mr. Tweedy had not the management of Lord Melville's private affairs.——*Q.* Explain to the Committee what circumstance could induce you to pay to Mr. Tweedy money on account of Lord Melville's private affairs, without Lord Melville's direction, and without considering Mr. Tweedy as being any private agent of Lord Melville's? *A.* I have already said that I had general directions from Lord Melville in the management of his private affairs, though not specific ones in every instance; and when any sum of money came into my hands upon his lordships account, I have taken it upon me to apply that money without directions from his lordship.——*Q.* What were those general directions? *A.* It was a general permission to act for Lord Melville as I thought proper, in his private affairs.

6th May.——*Q.* Can you recollect any thing about the repayment of the specific sum of 10,000l. which, at your commencing paymaster, Lord Melville acknowledged to you that he owed to the public? *A.* I do not.——*Q.* What sums did you annually receive, as my Lord Melville's private agent, from other sources, saving those of his salary as Treasurer of the Navy?——I do not recollect any regular annual payments made to me on his lordship's account, although I have received considerable sums, and in many instances.——*Q.* Can you form any opinion of the average? *A.* I cannot.——*Q.* Did you receive, as far as you are informed, all Lord Melville's private income in the capacity of his private agent? *A.* I believe I received all his income arising in this country, but I cannot speak with certainty.——*Q.* Did you receive for him his salary as Treasurer of the Navy? *A.* I did.——*Q.* The whole of it? *A.* As far as I recollect, I did.——*Q.* Have you brought the date of the releases? *A.* I have.——*Q.* What are they? *A.* They were signed by Lord Melville upon the 18th of February 1803, and by myself upon the 20th of that month.——*Q.* You having stated yourself to be still private agent to Lord Melville, what circumstance then led to the execution of mutual releases between you and Lord Melville? *A.* I know no circumstance, excepting that of his lordship having left this country, and as I thought, without any intention of returning; and I conceived that it would be a satisfaction to Lord Melville as well as myself that our heirs, in case of the death of either of us, should have as little trouble as possible in arranging the several accounts which had existed so long between us.——*Q.* Were the books of account destroyed before or after the execution of the releases? *A.* It was after that date.——*Q.* Who preceded you as paymaster? *A.* Mr. Douglas.——*Q.* Is he dead? *A.* He is.——*Q.* When did he die? *A.* In December 1785.——*Q.* Have you any means of knowing how long Lord Melville had had in his possession the sum of 10,000l. which Lord Melville acknowledged to have had in his possession at the time you became paymaster? *A.* I have not.——*Q.* How did Lord Melville describe to you that he had become possessed of the 10,000l. which he then described himself to owe to the navy pay-office? *A.* I do not remember that his lordship explained himself to me upon that subject.——*Q.* Had you any means of knowing whether that had been applied to a public or a private purpose? *A.* I had not, further than his lordship having expressed his apprehensions that it might ultimately be prejudicial to his interest.——*Q.* In what manner? *A.* He did not enter further in explanation with me on the subject.——*Q.* When you described this sum of 10,000l. to make part of a sum of 30,000l. which had been advanced to Mr. Tweedy for the use of Lord Melville, did you mean that you had been informed by Mr. Tweedy of this sum being

so applied; or was it from Lord Melville only that you derived any knowledge of this sum of 10,000l.? *A.* It was from Lord Melville only that I had any information upon the subject of this 10,000l.; and if I have conveyed, by my former evidence, the idea that this sum of money had been advanced to Lord Melville through the means of Mr. Tweedy, I must beg to correct that statement.——*Q.* Has that 10,000l. been repaid? *A.* That 10,000l. as well as every other sum for which Lord Melville has been indebted to the public, as Treasurer of the Navy, and which has accrued since the year 1786, when I was appointed Paymaster, has been repaid.

7th May.—*Q.* Where were the releases executed between you and Lord Melville? *A.* The release was signed by his lordship at his own house in Scotland, and by myself in London.——*Q.* Did any conversation relative to the account-books, or their destruction, take place between you and Lord Melville previous to their being destroyed? *A.* The subject never came *under consideration* between his lordship and myself, *to the best of my recollection.*——*Q.* Has any subsequent conversation taken place on that subject? *A.* None, except of my having informed his lordship of the fact, and *the regret which we have both felt on the circumstance.*——*Q.* Has any communication *by letter*, before or since, taken place upon that subject? *A. None whatever.*——*Q.* Can you give to the committee any more precise explanation of the conversation which you related yesterday to have taken place between you and Lord Melville, at the time he acknowledged his debt of 10,000l. to the public, when you commenced Paymaster, or can you recollect with more precision what the words were used by Lord Melville? *A.* I am sorry, from the distance of time when that conversation took place, that I have it not in my power to give any further explanation upon that subject.——*Q.* Please to repeat his words, as near as you can recollect, that you before mentioned? *A.* His lordship expressed his apprehensions that the circumstance alluded to might ultimately prove prejudicial to him, and which I concluded to be meant in a pecuniary light.——*Q.* What circumstance? *A.* The circumstance of the balance put under my charge being about 10,000l. less than the balance for which he was accountable to the public.——*Q.* Do you know whether Lord Melville has attested and returned to the proper officer, the general statement of his accounts transmitted to him to attest, but which, as appears in the 134th page of the Tenth Report, had not then been returned to the accountant, which prevented the account from being delivered into the Auditor's office? *A.* His lordship has attested and returned the account, and it was detained at the time which the accountant mentions, from the statement which had been sent to his lordship for his attestation having been found incomplete.——*Q.* Are the drafts drawn upon the bank from the Navy Pay-Office, when paid, returned to the office at stated periods? *A.* They are always returned when the book is balanced, which has been generally, but not invariably, once a month.——*Q.* When returned, are they preserved? *A.* They have not been preserved, as they are considered to be of no use when the balance is agreed.——*Q.* During the fourteen years you were paymaster, did you receive in all, upon Lord Melville's private account, to the amount of 20.000l.? *A.* I certainly have.——*Q.* What were the sources of income in England, of which you described yourself yesterday to be in the receipt on account of Lord Melville? *A.* I have, I believe, uniformly received his salary as Treasurer of the Navy; but I do not recollect that any other receipts which have come into my hands of his lordship's income was derived from any public situation, but has been confined to sums which I may have received in the management of his private affairs.——*Q.* What was the largest sum you ever had in your hands of the private account of Lord Melville at one time? *A.* That appears perfectly impossible for me to ascertain, as his private transactions passed through an account current in which his lordship was generally indebted to me; but at other times the balance was in favour of his lordship, when I neither charged interest upon any balance due by his lordship, nor did I charge myself with any interest at times when the balance may have been in his lordship's favour.——*Q.* Do you recollect the largest balance in the account current that ever appeared in favour of Lord Melville? *A.* In an account comprehending so long a period, it is very difficult for me to give an accurate answer to that question; but it certainly has at some time been as large as between 2,000l. or 3,000l. in Lord Melville's favour.——*Q.* Do you recollect the largest balance in the account current that ever appeared in your favour, with the same degree of accuracy? *A.* I do not recollect with the same degree of accuracy, but I have upon a former occasion declared it had never exceeded from 10 to 20,000l.——*Q.* Do you now allude to the sums mentioned in

your evidence before the Commissioners of Naval Enquiry, to have been advanced by you occasionally to Lord Melville, to the sums mentioned by you in your evidence before this committee to have been advanced to Lord Melville through the hands of Mr. Tweedy, Messrs. Drummond, and others, or to any other sums? *A.* I allude to the sums which I had occasionally advanced to Lord Melville, as stated in the Tenth Report; but some of those occasional advances may have been made through the hands of Mr. Tweedy, Messrs. Drummond, or others.——*Q.* Are the committee still to understand that you mean the advances of from 10 to 20,000l. as mentioned in the Tenth Report, to be distinct and different from the advances of 23,000l. made by you in the whole, as stated by you in evidence before this committee? *A.* They are still to understand so.——*Q.* Did these different advances all pass through your account current with Lord Melville? *A.* They did not. ——*Q.* Distinguish which did and which did not? *A.* I cannot do it from memory. ——*Q.* Have you any documents to refer to? *A.* I have already stated that I have none, and *my regret for that circumstance.*——*Q.* Why was some of the advances placed in the account current, and others not? *A.* I only placed the sums in the account current of which I knew of the appropriation; of the appropriation of the other sums I was ignorant.——*Q.* Do you mean by appropriation, that you had the payment of such sums on behalf of Lord Melville? *A.* With regard to the account current, I do.——*Q.* You have stated to the committee, in a former part of your evidence, that you did receive interest on some advances made to Lord Melville, on others none; you have to day stated, that in the account current you had neither charged interest to Lord Melville, when the balance in that account appeared in your favour, nor paid it when it appeared in favour of his lordship; on what advances then did you charge interest? *A.* I alluded to a sum of money *which his lordship directed me to borrow*, and for which his lordship paid a regular interest of 5l. per centum.

9th May.—*Q.* Were *you the lender* of the money borrowed for Lord Melville, and for which he paid an interest? *A.* I was.—— *Q.* What was the amount? *A.* My recollection does not enable me to state this with accuracy; but I believe, to the best of my knowledge, that it was a sum not exceeding from 20 to 23,000l.——*Q.* Is that sum repaid? *A.* It is.——*Q.* How long since? *A.* Four or five years.——*Q.* Was you agent for the whole of Lord Melville's income arising from private sources in England? *A.* As far as I know I was so.—— *Q.* Were you in the receipt of the whole or any part of Lord Melville's income, arising from private sources in Scotland? *A.* His lordship has made me frequent remittances from Scotland; but I do not know from what sources they arose.——*Q.* You were not then regularly in the receipt of Lord Melville's income arising from private sources in Scotland? *A.* I was not.—— ——*Q.* Do you know of any instance between August, 1796 and January, 1798, of any Navy Bill or Victualling Bill becoming due and presented for payment, not having been paid when presented, *owing to the want of effects* for the payment of such Navy and Victualling Bill? *A.* That *certainly is not within my knowledge.*——*Q.* Must you have known it from your situation in the Navy Pay Office, if such an event had actually happened? *A.* I think I must *unquestionably have known it.*——*Q.* During that period, in a former part of your evidence you have stated that your were in Scotland, had such a circumstance happened during your absence in Scotland, would it have been communicated to you officially, either by Mr. Wilson or Mr. Swaffield, Cashier of the Victualling Bills? *A.* Undoubtedly, a circumstance *so singular* would have been communicated to me by one or other of those gentlemen, especially as *I do not believe or recollect that any such circumstance had occurred during the whole time I acted as Paymaster of the Navy.*——*Q.* What is the longest period at any one time of your absence from London, during the time that you was paymaster, during which period Mr. Wilson was drawing money from the Bank with blank checks signed by you? *A.* I was absent from the Pay Office, I believe, between three and four months in the year 1797, upon the occasion of my marriage in Scotland; but I have very seldom been absent from the office for any period of time nearly approaching to this.

[Mr. Trotter produced release between him and Lord Melville—Release read.—— The passage *peculiar* to this release was in the following words.]

"Whereas for several years past there "have been sundry *accounts, reckonings,* "and *money transactions* depending be- "tween us, the account of which have late- "ly been examined, adjusted, and agreed "upon between us; and upon such exami- "nation, settlement, and adjustment, there "remained a balance due from the said "Alexander Trotter to the aforesaid Lord "Viscount Melville, of one thousand five

" hundred and eighty pounds, eleven shil-
" lings and one penny sterling money;
" with which final examination, statement,
" and adjustment, both parties declare them-
" selves perfectly satisfied, and do hereby
" approve of and ratify the same. And they
" have either *mutually delivered up to each*
" *other*, or resolved and agreed *mutually to*
" *cancel and destroy* all the *vouchers or other*
" *memorandums and writings*, that at any
" time heretofore may have existed, passed,
" or been interchanged between them rela-
" tive to the said accounts, and the different
" items and articles of which the said ac-
" counts are composed of or consist; and they
" have further resolved and agreed, mutual-
" ly to release and discharge each other up
" to the day of the date of these presents,
" for now and ever: therefore, &c. &c. &c."

Q. Who drew the release between you and Lord Melville? *A.* Mr. Spottiswoode, of Sackville-street, my solicitor.——*Q.* Is he *dead?* *A.* Yes.——*Q.* Who *settled* it? *A.* I do not know if any one.——*Q.* Who gave the instructions for it? *A.* It proceeded from an advice of Mr. Spottiswoode himself, who brought me the deed ready prepared, without any particular instructions from any one.——*Q.* Was any particular instruction given, or did any order or conversation take place upon the particular part of the deed which relates to the giving up or destruction of vouchers or other documents? *A.* None that I remember, excepting Mr. Spottiswoode's general observation, that it would be no longer necessary to preserve any vouchers relating to accounts between Lord Melville and myself.

[Here follows Trotter's evidence relative to the affair of Jellico, which evidence is omitted here as belonging to a subject to be considered separately.]

23*d May*.——*Q.* You have stated, that at various times you advanced various sums of money on account of Lord Melville to Mr. Tweedy, Messrs. Drummond, Mr. Alves the private secretary, and other members of Lord Melville's family; do you mean to state, that all the persons above enumerated received payments out of the sum of 22 or 23,000*l.* advanced by you at various times to Lord Melville, for which no interest was paid, or do you mean to describe them as the parties to whom payments had generally been made by you on Lord Melville's account, out of other as well as the fund abovementioned? *A.* I mean it of the latter description.——*Q.* Did you ever make any payment out of the above fund of 22 or 23,000*l.* to any member of Lord Melville's family? *A.* I do not remember that I ever did.——*Q.* Were the funds received by you, on Lord Melville's private account, paid into the mixed fund at Messrs. Coutts, which you have stated to consist partly of public and partly of private money? *A.* They were.——*Q.* Can you precisely state the persons to whom issues out of the above fund of 22 or 23,000*l.* were made? *A.* I have not means of precisely stating it.

27*th May*.——*Q.* You have stated, that you were in the habit of applying sums of money, on Lord Melville's account, under general instructions previously given to you for the management of his private affairs; do you recollect whether you applied, under such general instructions, any part of the 22 or 23,000*l.* on which you have stated no interest was charged? *A.* I do not recollect having applied any part of that money under general instructions, as these were the sums which Lord Melville never gave me any information upon.—*Q.* Was Mr. Tweedy employed in the management of issues on Lord Melville's account, out of any other fund than the above-mentioned fund of 22 or 23,000*l.*? *A.* I was in the habit of employing Mr. Tweedy in almost all my money transactions, with Lord Melville as well as with others.——*Q.* Was any part of that sum of 22 or 23,000*l.*, paid to Mr. Tweedy, without an antecedent order of Lord Melville? *A.* I do not recollect any.——*Q.* In the account of receipts and payments between the 1st and 31st of January, 1798, there appears an entry of a transfer to the victualling branch, to repay the like sum transferred from thence to " wages" in March, 1797; have you any recollection of the circumstances of that transfer and repayment? *A.* None whatever.——*Q.* Have you any recollection of any transfer and repayment of the like nature? *A.* Not of any of the like nature, but I have frequently from the navy branch to the pay branch, and vice versâ.

Examination of CHARLES LONG *(late a Secretary of the Treasury, since made one of the King's* MOST HONOURABLE *Privy Council, and now a Lord of the Treasury), on the 6th of May and 7th of May.*

6*th May*.——*Q.* State to the committee in what instances you have any knowledge of monies issued for navy services having been applied to purposes not naval? *A.* I know only of one instance; it is that which is referred to in the Tenth Report, where Mr. Trotter says, he had received from me a sum of money which he had before placed in the hands of Lord Melville. If the committee will give me leave, I will state

to them all the circumstances of the transaction to which this refers, as far as they are within my recollection at this distance of time: In the autumn 1796, I received a note from Lord Melville, requesting I would call upon him early the next morning at his office in Parliament-street; in a conversation I there held with him, he noticed the great difficulty in which all commercial men found themselves at that particular period, the alarm and distrust which prevailed, and the difficulty which they found of raising money upon the best securities; he said, that this embarrassment was particularly felt by the house of Messrs. Boyd and Company, who were contractors for the loan; that the bank had refused to make their payments on the loan as usual, or to discount their bills; and that, with ample securities in their hands, they were not enabled to raise money to pay the next instalment, which was then just becoming due. That under these circumstances he thought it a public object to support the house; that if the house failed it would involve many others in its ruin, and give a great blow to commercial credit, *already very much shaken*. He said they required the sum of 40,000l. to enable them to make good their engagement to government; that he had found the means of advancing that sum, and which he could do without inconvenience, provided undoubted security was given for the repayment of that sum within a very short period; that with this view of the subject he would place the sum of 40,000l. in my hands, desiring I would deliver it to Mr. Boyd, upon his giving such security as he had described, and that Mr. Boyd would call upon me at the Treasury the same day with such security. I do not affect to state this conversation with precise accuracy at this period, but as well as I recollect, the above is the substance of it. Upon going to the Treasury I found Mr. Boyd there, and delivered to him the sum of 40,000l., and received the security, amounting to something more than 40,000l.; I put these securities into a paper, which I sealed up, and transmirted them immediately to Lord Melville.——*Q.* Did you know from what source Lord Melville supplied the money? *A.* I certainly did not at the time, but I have not the least doubt that if I had known the source from whence it came, my conduct would have been precisely the same; I should have given credit to Lord Melville that he would not have diverted the public money for the shortest period from the service to which it was appropriated, to any other service, unless he could do so without inconvenience to that service, *without risk*, and under an extreme public exigency; and under that persuasion, I have no doubt I should have acted precisely as I did had I known the source from whence it came.—*Q.* What was the nature of the security given by Mr. Boyd? *A.* It consisted chiefly if not entirely, of bills drawn upon and accepted by the East India Company, the greatest part certainly of this kind; if there was any other it was government security.——*Q.* Do you recollect to about what amount the securities were? *A.* As far as I recollect, to near 41,000l.——*Q.* Were the repayments of this money made, or any part of them made, through your hands? *A.* The latter payments were made through my hands, amounting to above 11,000l.; Lord Melville, I think, in the Spring in 1797, transmitted to me two of the bills drawn upon and accepted by the East India Company, amounting to this sum, desiring that I would pay the sum of 11,000l. to Mr. Wilson, which was all that remained due of the 40,000l. and that I would pay the balance by which the security exceeded 40,000l., to Mr. Boyd; this I did, as the securities were paid.——*Q.* By whom were the bills on the East India Company drawn? *A.* I have no recollection.——*Q.* Can you say whether they were drawn by Mr. Boyd himself, or of any of the firm of that house? *A.* They were certainly not drawn by any of the firm of that house.——*Q.* Were they of the nature of such securities belonging to the East India Company, as are commonly in the market? *A.* I really do not know the nature of the securities of the East India Company, that are usually in the market.——*Q.* Do you know who were the acceptors? *A.* No, I do not.——*Q.* Can you state the precise date of the repayment of the balance of 11,000l.? *A.* 4,000l. in August, 1797; 1,000l., I think, in October, 1797; and 6,000l. early in January, 1798.——*Q.* Into whose hands were these sums paid? *A.* The first and second into the hands of Mr. Wilson, and the third into the hands of Mr. Trotter: as these sums were paid, Lord Melville was made acquainted with it, and I think the receipts of the parties were transmitted to him.——*Q.* From whom did you receive the money upon the securities as they became due? *A.* They were paid into Messrs. Drummonds, who are my bankers, and were received by them in the ordinary course of business; these were of course paid by the East India Company, upon whom they were drawn.——*Q.* Do you know any thing of the repayment of that part of the sum of 40,000l., which was not repaid by you? *A.* I do not; I under-

stood that it had been repaid a considerable time before the sum that passed through my hands, and I have a general recollection that most of the securities had but a very short time to run.——*Q.* Do you know of any other transaction of the same description, or of any description, in which money issued for naval services may have been applied for purposes not naval? *A.* I certainly do not. ——*Q.* Do you recollect, in point of fact, what was the amount of loans raised for the year 1796? *A.* There was a loan made in November or December, 1795, amounting to 18,000,000l., and there was another loan in the course of the year 1796 to the amount of seven millions and a half; Mr. Boyd was the contractor for both these loans.——*Q.* From the then state of the market, in case Mr. Boyd had been prevented from fulfilling his contract, do you conceive the public would have had the means of obtaining a new loan upon terms equally advantageous? *A.* I should think certainly not, it was a period of very great and peculiar embarrassment; it will be recollected that there was a very general run upon commercial houses, which was followed by a great pressure on the bank, and which led, early in the succeeding year, to the restriction of cash payments at the bank.——*Q.* Had the bank felt itself under the necessity, at that period, of narrowing materially its accommodation to government and to the public? *A.* To the best of my recollection it had; but that may be ascertained with much more precision than I can state it.——*Q.* Do you recollect what our relation with the Continent were at that moment, with respect to subsidies? *A.* I believe subsidies were in the course of remittance, but I cannot state precisely to what amount.——*Q.* When was the first loan raised for the service of the Emperor of Germany? *A.* I rather think in 1795.——*Q.* Supposing the contracts for the loans at the house of Messrs. Boyd had been dissolved by their failure of making instalments in the then state of the market, would it have been easy to make another loan in lieu thereof? *A.* I should think it would have been extremely difficult; but I suppose it might have been done, though upon terms certainly very disadvantageous to the public.——*Q.* Whether you explained to Mr. Boyd how the money was furnished which was transmitted to him by you? *A.* There was no necessity for any such explanation, as Mr. Boyd knew perfectly well that I had received it from Lord Melville, and was sent by Lord Melville to the Treasury to receive it from me.——*Q.* Did Lord Melville explain to you why he wished to furnish this accommodation to Mr. Boyd through you, rather than directly from himself? *A.* He did not; but I conceive it was furnished through me, because he supposed that he was giving assistance to the public in a manner in which he thought the Treasury particularly interested, and he explained to me, that he wished the transaction to be secret, as otherwise it might tend to injure the house of Messrs. Boyd.——*Q.* Did you make any immediate communication to the Chancellor of the Exchequer? *A.* I certainly did not; I acted under the impression that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was acquainted with the transaction; it is probable I may have conversed with him upon it, but I have no distinct recollection of any such conversation, except long subsequent to the transaction. I recollect his remarking upon it, that he thought a great irregularity had been committed, but that he thought a great public mischief had been prevented by it.——*Q.* Did you communicate with any other of the public servants on the subject? *A.* Certainly not.——*Q.* Did you commit to writing the whole or any part of the transaction? *A.* I did not.—— *Q.* Was there any document, to your knowledge, in existence, by which the public could have been made acquainted with this transaction? *A.* When I transmitted the security to Lord Melville, I wrote upon one of the covers in which the securities were inclosed, the purposes for which they had been deposited; namely, that they had been deposited for the purpose of the repayment of the sum of 40,000l., which had been advanced by Lord Melville to the house of Messrs. Boyd.——*Q.* Did that paper ever come again into your possession? *A.* No, never.——*Q.* Do you know whether it is in existence? *A.* I do not; I wrote a similar memorandum respecting those securities, which was afterwards returned to me.—*Q.* Is the memorandum last referred to in existence? *A.* I do not think it is.——*Q.* Was any interest paid by Messrs. Boyd for the loan of this money during the time they held it? *A.* Not to my knowledge.——*Q.* Whether in all other instances, where government have advanced to merchants temporary loans of money or exchequer bills, interest has not always been paid for such loans? *A.* I know of no instance at all similar to this, but in all public loans to merchants, interest, I believe, has always been paid.——*Q.* Whether Mr. Boyd had ever made any application to the treasury for assistance, to enable him to make good his payments on the loan, prior to the time when you conversed with Lord Melville on

the subject? *A.* To the best of my recollection he never had.——*Q.* Did he ever make any subsequent application? *A.* I believe not; I have no knowledge of any such application.——*Q.* Was the second loan for the service of the year 1796 a public loan, or was it given to Messrs. Boyd without any bidding, in consequence of his having contracted for the former loan? *A.* I rather think it was a public loan by bidding.——*Q.* Do you recollect the date of the contract for the second loan for 1796? *A.* I think it was in April, 1796.——*Q.* Were both loans made before this transaction? *A.* They certainly were.——*Q.* Were the instalments of both loans in a course of payment at the time that this transaction took place? *A.* They were.——*Q.* When did you become acquainted with the source from which Lord Melville took the money advanced to Messrs. Boyd? *A.* I certainly at first thought that Lord Melville had obtained this accommodation for Mr. Boyd either from Messrs. Drummonds, or from some of his private connexions, Mr. Boyd not having been able, from the extraordinary circumstances of the time to which I have before referred, to raise upon discount the whole sum which was necessary; but in the course of the transaction I certainly did believe that the money had been advanced from the balance in the hands of the Treasurer of the Navy; *at what period this idea came into my mind* I cannot at present state.—*Q.* Were you aware that in making such advance, the Treasurer of the Navy was acting illegally as well as irregularly? *A.* I probably had not the act of parliament very precisely in my recollection; and it does not occur to me now, that at the time I was satisfied he had acted illegally.——*Q.* Did Lord Melville tell you he had communicated with Mr. Pitt, and had his concurrence in the transaction? *A.* If I had recollected that he had made any such communication to me, the communication would probably have been made in the conversation which I have before described, and I should have mentioned it as part of that conversation; I have no recollection that he did make such a communication, but I think it very possible that he may have made it, and I certainly acted under the idea that the transaction was *known* to Lord Melville *and Mr. Pitt*, and to no other person.——*Q.* Was it *usual* with you to transact any business of great importance, or of an extraordinary nature, *without direct communication* with the First Lord of the Treasury, and taking his instructions personally or by letter? *A.* Certainly not.——*Q. How came* you then to *omit the precaution in this instance?* *A.* I have not said that I omitted the precaution in this instance, but I certainly have *no accurate recollection* of taking his instructions upon this subject; but I have before observed, that I acted under *the impression* of his knowledge of the transaction. I wish to add here, that the receipt of the money from Lord Melville, the payment of it to Mr. Boyd, and the transmission of the securities, took place within so short a space of time, that it is very probable *I had no opportunity* of receiving *particular instructions* within that period from Mr. Pitt; the whole business I understood to be of great urgency, and that it was necessary the assistance should be afforded to Mr. Boyd without any delay.—*Q.* Do you recollect whether Mr. Pitt first mentioned the subject *to you*, or *you to him?* *A.* I do not.——*Q.* Had you at any time previous to the late enquiry before the Naval Commissioners, any reason to suppose or believe that any other transaction of an irregular nature, other than the advance to Messrs. Boyd, had taken place in the conduct of the Pay Office of the Navy? *A.* I certainly had not.——*Q.* Had you at any time previous to the said period any knowledge of, or reason to suppose that profits had been made by any individual connected with that department, of the public money issued for service of the Navy? *A.* I had not.——*Q.* Did the payment of that 40,000l. to Mr. Boyd answer the intended purpose of saving the house from failure, and enable them to pay the subsequent instalments? *A.* The subsequent instalments upon both the loans of Mr. Boyd were paid, and the house did not fail; how far the 40,000l. contributed to the support of the house, it is impossible for me to state.——*Q.* Do you know whether Mr. Boyd is alive, and within the realm? *A.* I do not know; I heard of his being at Paris some time ago.——*Q.* How long since did you hear he was at Paris? *A.* I cannot answer that question with any sort of precision.——*Q.* At what period of time was it from the advances that were made to Messrs. Boyd and Benfield, that the transaction took place in which an extent was issued against their property on behalf of the crown? *A.* I believe, between two and three years; the extent, I believe, issued in the course of the year 1799.

Examination of WILLIAM PITT *(First Lord of the Treasury, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and one of the King's* MOST HONOURABLE *Privy Council), taken on the 6th, 7th, 8th, and 17th of May.*

Q. Do you know of any instance of mo-

ney, issued for naval service, applied to purposes not naval? *A.* I know of one such instance.——*Q.* Have the goodness to state it. *A.* It was an advance made from naval money, in the course of the year 1796; I *think* late in the summer or in the autumn 1796; I am not able to ascertain the precise time; it was made to the house of Messrs. Boyd and Benfield, who were then contractors for two loans for government; the advance was the sum of 40,000l. It was made in consequence of a representation, that, from the difficulty which existed at that time in obtaining advances, even on good security, they were under such pecuniary embarrassments as would prevent their making good an instalment due to government. Unquestionable securities were given for the repayment of the advance; and under these circumstances, knowing no other way at the time by which serious mischief to the public service could be prevented, and understanding that the naval service was not likely to suffer any inconvenience from this advance, I concurred in opinion with the Treasurer of the Navy, that it was adviseable to make it. I must beg the committee to understand, that I can only state the general substance of the transaction to the best of my recollection, not being able precisely to recall all particulars at this distance of time.——*Q.* To whom was the pecuniary embarrassments of the house of Boyd and Benfield made? *A.* To myself and Lord Melville. ——*Q.* At the same time? *A.* Whether separately or jointly I *cannot undertake to say*, but I *rather believe* both ways. ——*Q.* With whom did the proposition for the relief of the house of Boyd and Benfield, by the means which were afterwards resorted to, originate? *A.* I am confident the suggestion of the means *must have originated with the Treasurer of the Navy.*—— *Q.* Did the Treasurer of the Navy state in what manner he meant to obtain the money? *A.* I do *not recollect* that he did; but I *understood generally*, that it was money which could, in his opinion, be spared for a time without inconvenience, provided there was sufficient security for its repayment.——*Q.* Do you know in point of fact how it was obtained? *A.* I do not, from *my own knowledge.*——*Q.* Did you *enquire* into the nature of the securities that were taken, or their amount? *A.* I was *satisfied* at the time that the securities offered were such as might be depended upon, and *I think I understood* them to consist either of navy bills or of bills which had been accepted by the East India Company, which were to fall due at successive periods; but I do not recollect having myself seen the securities. ——*Q.* Did you conceive the transaction to be *irregular and illegal?* *A.* I certainly considered it as irregular; I do not know it *occurred* to me, *at the time*, that it was *positively illegal*; but I have no difficulty in saying, that I was so strongly impressed with the belief of its importance and urgent necessity, with a view to essential public interests, that I should have thought it my duty to incur the risk of committing an irregular and illegal act, rather than expose the public to the mischief which I thought would otherwise infallibly have arisen.—— *Q.* Did you *make any memorandum in writing* of the transaction, or any part of it? *A.* No, *I did not.*——*Q.* Did you take any steps towards obtaining *an indemnity* of such an irregularity, committed with your knowledge and concurrence? *A.* No, I did not; and I *conceive* that it was impossible for me to have done so, *without disclosing circumstances which must have been highly injurious to the mercantile house it concerned*, and might have in a great measure tended to counteract the objects of the public service which I had in view.——*Q.* When such delicacy as to the disclosure of the transaction had ceased, did you take any such steps? *A.* I have never hitherto taken any such steps; the *delicacy* attending such disclosure could never, I conceive, be considered as having ceased, till after the house in question became bankrupt.——*Q.* When did that happen? *A.* I really *do not recollect*, but it was a considerable time, I believe three or four years after the transaction; and I confess the necessity of applying for indemnity *did not then present itself to my mind.*——*Q.* Were any of the *other public servants* acquainted with the transaction? *A.* I *believe* no others, with the exception of Mr. Long, then one of the secretaries of the treasury, through whom the money was so advanced.——*Q.* Do you know any thing about the repayment of the money, or the periods at which it was repaid? *A.* I only know it as I learned it from Mr. Long, and I *cannot state precisely* particular periods; but I understood generally a large proportion of it to be within a short time. ——*Q.* Do you know if it has all been repaid? *A.* I have *no doubt* but it has——*Q.* Do you know of the existence of *any document* any where, at the time or since, or now, by which the public could have come at the knowledge of this transaction? *A.* I *do not know* of any memorandum or document made at the time, or since; but I conceive, that if the monies had not been punctually repaid, the securities deposited

must have led to ascertain to whom the advances were made.——*Q.* The money being paid, and the securities of course returned, was there, or is there any other source of such information? *A.* None, *that I know of*, but the evidence of the parties concerned.——*Q.* Then, supposing the death of such parties, was there, or is there, any such evidence at all? *A.* None, *that I know of*, since the repayment of the sums. ——*Q.* Do you know of any other advances of money issued for navy services to purposes not naval, at any time, or of any description? *A.* No, I *do not know* of any such advances.

7th May.——*Q.* Was any *interest* paid by Messrs. Boyd upon the loan of 40,000l.? *A.* I do *not know* that there was.——*Q.* Why was it not paid? *A.* No *demand* was made. ——*Q.* Do you recollect any *other instance* of public money advanced to commercial persons in which interest was not demanded? *A.* I do *not recollect* any similar instance of such an advance.——*Q.* Do you recollect any other instance where interest has not been paid? *A.* No.——*Q.* For *what reason* was the demand of interest omitted? *A.* I can assign no *specific reason*; it did not *occur to me* to be necessary. ——*Q.* What was the amount of money borrowed in the year 1795? *A.* I *cannot take upon myself to say* at this moment.—— *Q.* Do you recollect how many loans were made in that year? *A.* I *cannot now state* it with any accuracy, but there was one made in December 1795?——*Q.* Was Mr. Boyd contractor for all or any of the loans made in 1795? *A.* I am sure he was contractor for the loan made about December 1795; I do *not recollect* any preceding loan.——*Q.* Was the loan of December 1795 a close loan, or a loan by public bidding? *A.* There was one of the loans with Mr. Boyd *a close* loan, but *cannot recollect* which.——*Q.* Do you recollect that Mr. Boyd laid claim to the loan in December 1795, in consequence of any *previous transactions between you and him*, or of any *understanding that had taken place between you?* *A.* I cannot *take upon myself to state these circumstances now with accuracy upon recollection*, and I beg to refer to the examinations that were taken when the transaction was recent.——*Q.* Was not a loan of 7,500,000l. or thereabouts, contracted for in or about the month of April 1796? *A.* I *believe* there was.——*Q.* Was Mr. Boyd contractor for that loan? *A.* He was.—— *Q.* Was that a *close* or open loan? *A.* I do *not now recollect*.——*Q.* Do you recollect about what time the house of Boyd stated to you their difficulties for the first time? *A.* I do not.——*Q.* Can you recollect whether it was previous to the loan of the spring 1796? *A.* I *believe* not.——*Q.* Do you recollect a notice given by the Bank in December 1795, of their intention to narrow their discounts? *A.* I recollect such a notice being given, but I *cannot now state* at what precise period.——*Q.* Was that notice acted upon? *A.* I *understand* it was.—— *Q.* Do you recollect a general complaint, that the acting upon that notice had tended to increase the embarrassment prevailing in the commercial world at that time? *A.* I recollect much complaint of *that nature*. ——*Q.* Did Mr. Boyd make any particular and specific complaint to you of his own embarrassments, in consequence of the conduct of the bank? *A.* I *believe* he complained of its effects.——*Q.* Had you any communication with the governor and company of the bank on this subject of their conduct? *A.* I *think* I had conversation on the subject of their conduct in narrowing their discounts at different times.——*Q.* Do you recollect the date of the first? *A.* I do not.——*Q.* Can you give the committee any information as to the probable date of such communications? *A.* I really cannot, as I do *not at present recollect* when the measure was adopted.——*Q.* Can you recollect the reasons assigned by the governor and company of the Bank of England for their conduct in so narrowing their discounts? *A.* As well as I recollect, but I *cannot at this distance of time speak with certainty*, the reasons assigned were the decrease of cash in their possession, and a desire to check speculation, to which they thought those discounts were applied.—— *Q.* Did any particular conversation take place on the subject of the house of Boyd and Company in your communications with the bank, or was that house mentioned in any conversations that passed at that period? *A.* I *rather think*, that house has been mentioned in some conversations, but I cannot now recollect with any precision.——*Q.* Do you recollect the *drift* of any such conversations relating to that house? *A.* No, I do not.——*Q.* Did the house of Boyd complain, or ever state to you that the bank were not so liberal in their discounts to that house as to others? *A.* I *think* they did.——*Q.* Did you enquire into the reason of the particular conduct of the bank towards that house? *A.* I do *not recollect* that I did.——*Q.* Do you recollect any general information you may have received from any quarter of the reasons for that particular conduct? *A.* I do not.——*Q.* When was you first informed

of the danger in which that house found itself? *A.* I *cannot say*; in the course of the year 1796, I believe.——*Q.* Was that danger ascribed by them to the particular conduct of the bank towards them? *A.* To the *best of my recollection* it was.——*Q.* Do you believe the conduct of the bank towards them at that time to have been an exception to their then general conduct? *A.* I do *not know* that it was, but I have not sufficient knowledge of the particulars to form a judgment on that subject.——*Q.* Was it so stated to be by Boyd and Company? *A.* I *rather think* that they represented an opinion, that the conduct of the bank was adopted with views unfavourable to them. ——*Q.* Have you any reason to believe such representations were well founded? *A.* I have had *no means of forming a judgment* upon that subject.——*Q.* Do you believe the bank to have been under difficulties about that period? *A.* I *believe* the difficulties of the bank, which led to the suspensions of their payments in cash in the February following, were commencing in that year, or perhaps the preceding.——*Q.* Have you any reason to believe those difficulties to have intermitted, or have been suspended about the period of the advance to Messrs. Boyd of 40,000l.? *A.* I do *not at present recollect* any reason for such belief.——*Q.* Did you know that the 40,000l. so advanced would be drawn from the bank? *A.* I had *no knowledge* of the particular mode by which that sum would be furnished,——*Q.* Did you believe it would come out of the public money advanced for navy services? *A.* I did.——*Q.* Ought not such money, according to law, to remain in the bank till assigned to, or drawn for particular navy services? *A.* Yes, I *conceive* so.——*Q.* Were you at the time aware of such legal provisions? *A.* I certainly must have known the *existence* of the act; but *its particular provision was not at that time under my contemplation.*——*Q.* Did the governor or deputy governor of the Bank of England, in the information which they gave to you of one of the reasons which induced them to narrow their discounts, namely, for the purpose of checking speculation, allude at all, or in any way to the house of Boyd? *A.* I *cannot take upon myself to say* either way.——*Q.* Did the governor or deputy governor of the Bank of England, in the information they gave you of the reasons for their conduct in narrowing their discounts, state the necessity for their so doing, in consequence of the large advances under which they were to government, and which had not been replaced according to agreement? *A.* I *think* they made representations to that effect; but for the particulars I would beg again to refer to examinations which were taken before the committee soon after that period.——*Q.* Had you any money transactions on the part of the public with the house of Boyd, subsequent to the loan of the spring 1796? *A.* I *think* there was an issue of money to them for public service, which appeared in the extraordinary of the army in 1797.——*Q.* To what amount? *A.* It will appear by the extraordinaries; I *think* about 100,000l. and, *as well as I recollect*, it was for the remittance of silver from India to the Cape.——*Q.* Did they apply to you, or were they competitors for any loan subsequent to the loan for the spring 1796? *A.* I *do not recollect.*——*Q.* Was any information given to you, or had you any reason to believe the house of Boyd and Company were engaged in speculations to any amount besides their engagements for the loans negotiated with them? *A.* I *understood* them to be engaged in very extensive pecuniary or mercantile transactions as bankers and remitters, but I had no knowledge of the particulars.——*Q.* Was any information given to you, or hint thrown out, of the probability of the event which actually took place, namely, the failure of the house of Boyd and Company? *A.* I heard surmisses to that effect, but I *cannot say* at what time.——*Q.* Can you say that it was not at an earlier period than the one at which the 40,000l. was advanced? *A.* I do not *think* that it was.——*Q.* Do you know any thing of the causes which led to that failure? *A.* Nothing precisely.——*Q.* Have you heard what those causes were? *A.* I *cannot pretend to recollect* them now with precision; the narrowing the discounts of the bank, and their refusal in 1796 to make the accustomed advances on the loan, was stated as circumstances very prejudicial to them; but how far these were the causes of their ultimate failure I *cannot judge.*——*Q.* Did you ever hear there were large speculators in the public funds at the period of the negotiations at Lisle? *A.* I have *heard* such report, but *know nothing* of the subject.——*Q.* What was the nature of the injury the public was likely to sustain from a full disclosure of all the circumstances relating to the advance made to Messrs. Boyd and Benfield, as soon as they had made good all the instalments of the loan? *A.* I meant in that part of my answer, to apply particularly to the period while the instalments of the loans were not made good; the injury afterwards to the public would have been that of the failure

of *any great mercantile house;* but in that latter period, the principal reason I assigned for avoiding disclosure, was, *the injurious effect it would have upon the parties themselves.*——*Q.* Do you conceive the 40,000*l.* advanced to Mr. Boyd, if it had not been so advanced, would have been productive of any interest to the public? *A.* I *conceive* certainly not.——*Q.* Will you state generally to the committee, what you recollect to have been the state of the money market in the course of the year 1796, and the beginning of the year 1797? *A.* I *conceive* it to have been a period of the greatest embarrassment, both of public and private credit, and it led to the circumstance of the stoppage of the payment of cash by the bank in the spring 1797.——*Q.* From the then state of the public money market, in case Mr. Boyd had failed in making good his payments, and the contracts for the two loans then in progress of payment had been dissolved, do you conceive a new loan could have been procured for the public on terms equally advantageous? *A.* I am perfectly convinced that it would not, and that the embarrassment that it would have occasioned to the public service *would have been of the most serious and alarming nature.*——*Q.* In the then state of the market, would it have been easy to have made a loan in lieu thereof? *A.* No, it would have been extremely difficult, and I *believe* impossible, unless upon most unfavourable terms.——*Q.* To what extent do you conceive the failure of Messrs. Boyd's loan would have effected the general credit of the country? *A.* To a very *great and serious extent.*——*Q.* Would the effect have been such as to render the fulfilment of any future contract to be made with other parties, in a considerable degree, precarious and uncertain? *A.* That is matter of opinon of which I *cannot speak positively*, but I think there would have been *great danger of such an effect.*——*Q.* Have you any knowledge of a certain sum of public money, amounting to 10,000*l.* being in the hands of Lord Melville in the beginning of the year 1786? *A.* No, I have not.

8th May.——*Q.* Were any representations at any time made to you by any body, of the circumstance of money issued to the bank for navy services, being drawn from thence, and lodged in the hands of a private banker or bankers? *A.* I have a *general recollection*, that Mr. Raikes, one of the bank directors, and, *I believe*, either governor or deputy governor at the time, took some occasion to mention to me, that he believed sums were drawn from the bank to a larger amount than *he supposed* to be necessary, and carried to a private banker's, but *no memorandum or document of any sort was given to me;* and at this distance of time, I can only state the substance of what passed very generally, and *cannot undertake with any precision to recollect* the particulars.——*Q.* Had you any communication with the Treasurer of the Navy in consequence of what Mr. Raikes had told you? *A.* Yes, I had; I took an early opportunity of stating to him the *opinion* which Mr. Raikes had expressed to me.——*Q.* What further passed on the subject? *A.* I *cannot state precisely* the conversation that took place between us, but I was *led to suppose* from what passed, that the Treasurer of the Navy *did not believe* that any larger sums were drawn from the bank than such as were necessary for carrying on the detail of the service in payment to individuals? but I beg to have it understood, that I *cannot state with any precision* the terms which were used, I only state the general impression left upon my mind.——*Q.* Was that general impression such as to lead you to disbelieve the fact stated to you by Mr. Raikes, namely, that money was drawn from the bank under the authority of the Treasurer of the Navy, and lodged at a private banker's? *A.* It did not lead me to disbelieve the facts, that money was drawn from the bank, and lodged at a private banker's; but it *led me to believe* that no other sums were drawn but such as were necessary for carrying on the details of the service.——*Q.* Were you aware that such proceeding on the part of the Treasurer of the Navy was irregular? *A.* I was *so far satisfied* with the general statement so given me, that I made *no further inquiry*, and did not *particularly advert to the provisions of the act of parliament;* and it *did not occur to my mind*, that drawing such sums of money as were necessary for carrying on the details of the service was an illegal practice.——*Q.* Did you *take any steps to verify the statements* made to you, by calling for an examination of any books, accounts, or papers on the subject? *A.* No, *I did not*; I beg leave to observe, that I have already stated that I was so far satisfied with the general statement which I received in conversation with the Treasurer of the navy, that I made no further enquiry.——*Q.* Did you inform Mr. Raikes of *the satisfaction* you had obtained from your conversation with the Treasurer of the navy? *Q.* I do *not recollect* having afterwards any conversation with Mr. Raikes on the subject.——*Q.* Did *you inform any other of the public servants*, or any of the law officers of the crown, of the communication that had been made to you by Mr. Raikes?

A. No, I did not; *no impression was left on my mind*, after the conversation with the Treasurer of the Navy, to make me *feel it necessary* to take any steps on the subject. ——*Q.* Although you did not know to what extent money was so drawn from the bank by the Treasurer of the navy, and lodged at a private banker's, did you know the practice was continued? *A.* I do *not recollect knowing* any thing afterwards on the subject; but I *conceived*, from the Treasurer of the navy's conversation, that the practice took place only as necessary for carrying on the services, as I have already explained.——*Q.* Did you *investigate* such necessity? *A.* No, I *did not*; I relied on the opinion given me by the Treasurer of the Navy, without further examination. ——*Q.* Do you recollect how soon after the conversation with Mr. Raikes, your conversation with the Treasurer of the Navy took place? *A.* I do *not recollect* with any certainty, but I believe very soon after; *probably* on the first occasion I had of conversing with him, *when our attention was not engaged by other pressing business.*——*Q.* Did he state to you any ground of the necessity he alleged for placing the money at a private banker's? *A.* I have already said, that I *cannot*, at this distance of time, *recollect the particulars of what passed*; but I *believe* that he stated his opinion of the impossibility of carrying on various detailed payments in any other manner.——*Q.* Do you recollect that the propriety of the revision of the existing laws on the subject formed any part of that conversation? *A.* No, I am *persuaded* it did not; he did not *appear* to me to have any *impression on his mind* that what was done was contrary to law.——*Q.* On what ground, as far as you can recollect, did Mr. Raikes make any communication to you on the subject? *A.* I have already stated that *my recollection does not enable me to refer to the particulars* of the conversation, but I *conceive* him to have stated, that he supposed money to be withdrawn to a greater amount than was necessary for the public service.——*Q.* Had you any information at any time from any person, in any manner, of irregularity in the management of the public money advanced for navy services besides the communication made by Mr. Raikes; or did you, in point of fact, know of any such irregularities in any other manner? *A.* I had no such information besides that referred to, nor did I know any thing further on the subject until at a period long subsequent, I learned from Lord Harrowby, then Treasurer of the Navy, that *he thought* the practice which had prevailed irregular, and was *taking steps* for altering it. ——*Q.* Had you any conversation or correspondence with Lord Melville in consequence of such communication from Lord Harrowby? *A.* No, I had not.——*Q.* When this communication was made to you by Mr. Raikes, did he suggest to you any idea of any improper application or use of the money so taken out of the Bank? *A.* I have *no recollection* that he did.——*Q.* Had you, previous to the late inquiry before the Naval Commissioners, any knowledge of, or reason to suspect that private profits had been made by Mr. Trotter, or any other person, of naval monies, or that the business of the office was so conducted as to admit of private profit being made of such monies by any officer of that department? *A.* I had no knowledge at any time, previous to the inquiry before the Naval Commissioners, of any such profits having been made by any person; nor had I any suspicion of the business being so conducted as to admit of it till after the communication I have before adverted to with Lord Harrowby, which conversation, to the *best of my recollection*, took place *when I was out of office.*——*Q.* Had you, previous to the above inquiry, any knowledge of any other sum other than the 40,000l. stated to be advanced to Mr. Boyd, being at any time diverted from the service of the navy to purposes not naval? *A.* None whatever.——*Q.* Did Lord Harrowby tell you that he knew, or that he had reason to suppose, that profit had been made of public money issued for naval service? *A.* I do *not think* he told me that he knew that it had, but he *appeared* to *suppose* that it *might* have been.——*Q.* Were any steps taken by you to ascertain the fact? *A.* No; there were not.——*Q.* Had you known at the time that profits were derived from the public money placed in the hands of private bankers, should you have deemed it irregular and illegal, and consequently a practice that ought immediately to have been stopped? *A.* I should certainly have deemed it a practice that ought immediately to have been stopped.

17th May.——*Q.* Have you any reason to suppose that 20,000l. of money issued for naval services, was applied to purposes not naval, during the last treasurership of Lord Melville, besides the sum of 40,000l. stated to have been advanced to the house of Boyd and Benfield, in the year 1796? *A.* I *understood* from conversation with Lord Melville, that to the *best of his recollection*, that was nearly the amount; and on that ground I stated my belief to that effect in the House of Commons.——*Q.* Have you any infor-

mation *as to the purpose* to which such money was applied? *A.* I have not.—*Q.* Did you MAKE ANY INQUIRY of Lord Melville on the subject? *A.* I *did not*.——*Q.* When did the conversation take place? *A.* Some time *after* the Tenth Report was published.

Examination of THOMAS RAIKES, *(late Governor of the Bank of England) on the 8th of May.*

Q. Are you aware of the provisions of the act of the 25th Geo. III. cap. 31, for regulating the office of Treasurer of the Navy, in so far as they relate to the issues of public money to the Bank for naval services? *A.* I never *saw* the act, or ever *heard* any particulars of it.——*Q.* Do you know in point of fact, that public money for naval services is issued by the Exchequer to the Bank, to be drawn from thence by the Treasurer of the Navy or his agent, when applied to such services? *A.* Yes, I know that is the custom of the business, and that it came to the cashier's office in the Bank. ——*Q.* How is it drawn from thence? *A.* I cannot speak from my own knowledge, the cashier manages all that business.——*Q.* Do you know if any sums of money paid from the Exchequer into the Bank for naval services have been drawn from the Bank, and placed in the hands of private bankers? *A.* From my *own knowledge* I cannot say I do *know*.——*Q.* Has such information been given to you at any time? *A.* Yes, I believe in the year 1797.——*Q.* By whom? *A.* Mr. Giles, the then late Governor of the Bank, told me that Mr. Dundas, then Treasurer of the Navy, kept his cash, which by act of parliament he was directed to keep at the Bank, at the private banking-house of Messrs. Coutts and Company. I *was going* that day to the Chancellor of Exchequer on business from the Bank, and I thought it of *sufficient consequence* to mention the matter to him, but I called in Mr. Newland, the cashier, and asked him as to the circumstance, which he confirmed; and added, that navy bills were now paid by drafts upon Messrs. Coutts and Company, instead of upon the Bank, as they had formerly been: when I went up to Mr. Pitt, after the immediate object of my business from the Bank was over, I did, *in conversation*, mention the circumstance to him ——*Q.* Did any thing further pass? *A.* Nothing particular; I *think* Mr. Pitt thanked me for my information, and made *no further observation*.—— *Q.* Did Mr. Giles tell you any thing of the extent of these transactions, or when they commenced? *A.* Not that I recollect.—— *Q.* Had you any other conversation with the Chancellor of the Exchequer than the one you have now stated? *A.* None that I *recollect*.——*Q.* Upon a point of this nature, affecting the interest of the Bank as well as those of the public, did it not occur to you to inquire whether any, or what steps had been taken in consequence of your former suggestion? *A.* I looked upon it that *having made the matter known to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it was in the hands of the person most competent* to set any thing right that might be wrong in the business; I do *not recollect* I heard any thing more upon the subject in the course of my office.——*Q.* Did you, on your return to the Bank, make any minute of the substance of what had passed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer on this subject? *A.* I mentioned the matter to the Committee of Treasury and several of the Directors, but I made no particular minute of it; I had always made minutes when I was in the situation of Deputy Governor, but another gentleman was now in that situation, and the practice was then discontinued, only a clerk was appointed to take minutes of any actual business that passed between the Governors and the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but matters of *conversation* were not included.——*Q.* Is it not usual to cause a minute to be taken of any representation made by the Governor or Deputy Governor of the Bank, which they consider as official? *A.* This communication was *not considered as official*.——*Q.* Of whom did the Committee of Treasury consist at that time? *A.* Mr. Thomas Raikes, Governor, Mr. Samuel Thornton, Sir Richard Neave, Mr. Darell, Mr. Bosanquet, Mr. Giles, and Mr. Mathew.——*Q.* Do you recollect the terms in which you made this communication to Mr. Pitt? *A.* Only as I before stated.——*Q.* What was the date of the communication you made to Mr. Pitt? *A.* I do not know, but it was some time after the 5th of April, 1797.——*Q.* Was any information officially given to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the part of the Bank, *after your communications* made to the Committee of Treasury? *A.* I do not recollect that any were.——*Q.* Did you consider the information given to the Committee of Treasury, as a matter of business brought before them on which it became them to act, or only as a report of a conversation that had taken place? *A.* Merely in *the latter light*; I did not conceive the Bank had *any right to apply further* on the subject to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.——*Q.* Can you mention in what terms you made the communication to Mr. Pitt? *A.* I told him that

I had heard at the Bank that morning, that the Treasurer of the Navy now kept his cash at Messrs. Coutts and Company's instead of the Bank, *where I understood it should be lodged by act of parliament*; and that I had also heard that navy bills were now paid by drafts upon Messrs. Coutts and Company, instead of drafts upon the Bank.——*Q.* Are you certain that those are the terms in which you made the communication? *A.* I am not sure of the terms, it was eight years ago; but I am sure of the purport.——*Q.* Had you any authority from the Bank to mention the conversation alluded to, to the Chancellor of the Exchequer? *A.* None, I did it with a view *to the* PUBLIC *good.*——*Q.* You mentioned it as an *individual* only? *A.* I cannot say *quite* as an *individual*; I was Governor of the Bank at the time I learned it at the Bank, and mentioned it to Mr. Pitt, being Governor of the Bank; I should not have known it had I not been in that situation, nor had any opportunity of making the communication.——*Q.* Did you mention the circumstance to Mr. Pitt, as Governor of the Bank? *A.* I had *no commission* from the Bank to mention it to Mr. Pitt, but I did it in conversation after the business was over.——*Q.* By the word "business," do you mean such communication to the Chancellor of the Exchequer upon the business of the Bank, which, as Governor of the Bank, you was *authorized* to make to him? *A.* I do.——*Q.* All the business which you were to communicate to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, as Governor of the Bank, was concluded previous to any such communication as that to which you have alluded? *A.* It was.——*Q.* Might not the circumstance you mentioned to Mr. Pitt have come equally to the knowledge of any holder of a navy bill, or to any person whom Mr. Giles informed as he did you? *A.* Any holder of a navy bill, who received for payment a draft upon Coutts, must certainly know who paid them, but perhaps he might be ignorant from whence the funds came; but any person to whom Mr. Giles communicated the information he did to me, was equally master of it as I was.——*Q.* When you made this communication to Mr. Pitt, did you not conceive you was discharging your duty, *as Governor of the Bank*, although not acting officially? *A.* I had *no commission* from the Bank, but I thought it a duty to the *public* Mr. Pitt should know it.——*Q.* Was the Deputy Governor of the Bank present at this conversation with Mr. Pitt, or any other person? *A.* I make no doubt the Deputy Governor was, though I do not absolutely recollect the circumstance, for I always avoided going alone to the Chancellor of the Exchequer when I was Governor of the Bank, lest by failure of memory I might ever omit any part of the business I had to do.——*Q.* Who was Deputy Governor at that time? *A.* Mr. Samuel Thornton.——*Q.* When Mr. Giles informed you of the circumstance of the Treasurer of the Navy keeping his cash at a private banker's, did he throw out any hints that such money was applied for the profit of any person? *A.* No.——*Q.* Did any such idea suggest itself to you, or did you at the time ever hear it, or know any thing of the matter? *A.* I cannot say but I had *some suspicion* of it, but nobody ever told me, nor did any thing of the kind ever come to my knowledge.——*Q.* Do you recollect stating any suspicion of that sort to Mr. Pitt, or throwing out any hint tending that way? *A.* As I knew nothing of that kind, I had *no right* to throw out suspicions.——*Q.* When did you first entertain such suspicions? *A.* When Mr. Giles first mentioned it to me.

Examination of THOMAS WILSON *(late a Clerk under Lord Melville, and now under Mr. Canning), taken on the 11th of May; as far as relates to the Loan to Boyd and Co.*

Q. What means had each Board of judging of the balance in the Treasurer's hands at the Bank, at their disposal, at any particular moment? *A.* By the accounts rendered every fortnight, they are fully informed of the amount of the receipts and payments, from which they can judge of the balance in the Treasurer's hands belonging to their department.——*Q.* By whom is such fortnightly statement laid before them? *A.* The accounts are made out in the navy and victualling branches, and transmitted to the Boards, with the signature of the paymaster.——*Q.* Has the Treasurer of the Navy any control in the making out of such account? *A.* None whatever.——*Q.* Cannot the respective boards at once ascertain the precise balance subject to their further assignment, by comparing their own assignments already made with the issues notified to have been made by the Exchequer for the service of their particular department, a copy of which notification you stated to be regularly transmitted to them at the time of such issue? *A.* I unquestionably believe they can.——*Q.* May not victualling bills, accepted by agents of the victualling office from abroad, be presented for payment when there are no effects in the hands of the

Treasurer of the Navy for paying the same, in consequence of the victualling board not having estimated the payment of the same in any previous memorial to the treasury, of such board not having had notice that such bills were likely to be presented? *A.* It is not likely that any victualling bill could be presented to the Treasurer of the Navy for payment, unless duly assigned for that purpose by the board.——*Q.* Might it not have been presented to the board, and their assignment refused, until a credit upon their memorial to the treasury was established at the bank for paying the same? *A.* I certainly believe that such circumstances may have occurred in the victualling office.——*Q.* Do you recollect any instance of payment delayed, or refused, upon any victualling bill actually assigned by the commissioners? *A.* I do not recollect of such a circumstance ever having happened.——*Q.* Can you take upon you to say that no delay or embarrassment, or inconvenience of any kind, did arise in any department of the Navy Pay Office in consequence of the irregular advance of 40,000l. in the year 1796? *A.* I do not recollect that any complaint or inconvenience did arise in consequence thereof.——(Question repeated.) *A.* I certainly do not recollect of any inconvenience having arisen from it.——(Question again repeated.) *A.* I really believe no inconvenience could arise from it.

Examination of GEORGE BARCLAY *(a Merchant) taken 10th of May.*

Q. Do you know of any instance, between August 1796 and January 1798, of any victualling bill which had been regularly accepted, and presented for payment, not having been paid when so presented for want of effects? *A.* The case happened to me in an instance of my own.——*Q.* State the case? *A.* It was in a bill of 1,000l. drawn from Martinique by Mr. Desborough upon the victualling office, regularly accepted, and due the 18th February 1797, and paid without interest on the 1st of March, eleven days after it was due——*Q.* When it became due, was it presented for payment, and if presented, what answer? *A.* I presented it myself the day it became due at the victualling office, and I was told there were no effects, or to that purport, and that I must call again; I was told at the victualling office by the people there, that there were a great many bills in a similar situation; cannot say who the individuals were that gave the answer.——*Q.* Do you know of any navy bill due, not having been paid when presented for payment within the period alluded to? *A.* I cannot speak from my own knowledge; I have not the least doubt of the fact.——*Q.* Did you call between the 18th of February and the 1st of March? *A.* I sent one of my clerks two or three times, and received the same answer, till the 1st March.

Examination of JOHN MARSH *(a Commissioner of the Victualling Board) taken 17th May.*

Q. Do you recollect, in February 1797, a victualling bill for 1,000l., drawn from Mr. George Desborough, from Martinique and payable to T. Marcarty and Co. to be presented by Mr. Barclay at the victualling office for payment? *A.* I have no other recollection of the circumstance than what has recently come to my knowledge.——*Q.* State the circumstances. *A.* A bill of exchange for 1,000l. drawn by Mr. George Desborough, was ordered on the 6th of February 1797 to be accepted from the time it was left, and became due on the 18th of February; on the 9th February, the victualling board wrote for 70,000l., for the payment of bills of exchange, in which sum the bill in question was included; on the 25th of February 47,000l. was received in part of the sum applied for, and on the same day the above bill with many others, were assigned for payment, and immediately ready for delivery; it was delivered on the first of March following to Mr. Barclay, who might have had it, as I am informed, in time for payment, on the 25th of February, had he applied for it. I received this information from the accomptant; I knew nothing of the transaction myself.——*Q.* Did the accomptant officially report these circumstances for your information as a commissioner of the board? *A.* As a commissioner of the board, at my desire; I was not then a member of the board at the time the transaction took place.——*Q.* Have you ever known payment delayed, or refused, on any victualling bill actually assigned by the commissioners of the victualling board on the Treasurer of the Navy? *A.* No; the bills are never, to the best of my recollection, assigned till we know there are monies ready in the hands of the Treasurer of the Navy to discharge them.——*Q.* Have assignments ever been delayed, to your knowledge, on account of the want of money in the hands of the Treasurer of the Navy to cover such assignments? *A.* The account which is preparing, in answer to the precept of this committee directed to the victualling board, will shew what delay has occasionally occurred.

Examination of GEORGE SWAFFIELD *(Cashier in the Victualling Office) taken 10th May.*

Q. What are you? *A.* Cashier of the victualling in the Navy Pay Office.——*Q.* Do you know any thing of any bill accepted by the commissioners of the victualling office, and presented for payment when due, not having been paid at the office when so presented, between August 1796 and January 1798? *A.* I do not recollect any such circumstance, if the bill was complete.——*Q.* What is the meaning of the bill being "complete?" *A.* That the bill might be accepted by the board, but not assigned by them for want of money.——*Q.* What is the meaning of "not assigned for want of "money?" *A.* The money not having been issued from the Exchequer to the Treasurer of the Navy for the payment of it.——*Q.* On what head of account at the Bank would the assignment of a bill upon the victualling office be made? *A.* On the head of victualling.——*Q.* Is that class or head of payment distinct from the bill and payment office? *A.* It is so distinct, that I have never any cash at the Bank but under that head of victualling.——*Q.* Did it frequently happen that bills accepted were not assigned for want of money? *A.* I have known many instances of it.——*Q.* Did such instances occur frequently between the month of August 1796 and January 1798? *A.* Most probably they did; I cannot pretend to say, without my books of accounts.——*Q.* By reference to these books of accounts, can you discover what number of bills due, and presented, were not paid within the periods alluded to, because they had not been assigned for want of money? *A.* No, I cannot myself, but I could learn it from the Victualling Board.——*Q.* Do you apprehend it can be ascertained by reference to documents in the victualling office? *A.* Certainly.——*Q.* Would the assignment of accepted bills have been delayed, if a balance under that head of issue appeared in the books of the commissioners of victualling to be at that time in the hands of the Treasurer of the Navy? *A.* I believe not, that belongs to the victualling board.——*Q.* Do you conceive the delay of assignments to have been occasioned by the delay of funds being issued from the Exchequer to the credit of the Treasurer of the Navy at the Bank, or by any circumstance in the mode of conducting the business in the Treasurer of the Navy's Office, after the funds had been issued to him? *A.* The delay is certainly for want of money being at the Bank in the treasurer's name for that or any purpose.——*Q.* Who is the head clerk of the pay branch in the Navy Pay Office? *A.* John Swaffield, deputy to the paymaster.——*Q.* By whom are the assignments made? *A.* Of these bills that I pay, the assignments are made by three or more commissioners of victualling.——*Q.* Has the Treasurer of the Navy any thing to do with the making the assignment? *A.* No.——*Q.* Does not the Treasurer of the Navy order the issue of the money when the assignments are made? *A.* Whenever the commissioners of victualling assign bills for payment, they send a list of those bills by way of advice, and that list is generally sent to me, on which I apply for money to pay it.——*Q.* Is such list sent *previous to the assignment being made?* *A.* I cannot say positively, but my instructions are not to pay those bills without first having the list.——*Q.* Is the list submitted to any body before it comes to you? *A.* Very rarely.——*Q.* Is it ever, or has it ever been? *A.* Not that I can recollect; those lists are generally sent to me open by one of their messengers, and frequently by one of their clerks.——*Q.* Do you ever recollect notice having been sent to the victualling office not to make assignments of any list, or any bill or bills included in any list, or any victualling bill or bills of any description, till further order or communication? *A.* I certainly never knew an instance of that kind, and I have been three or four and thirty years in my present situation; I have been sixty years in all.——*Q.* How are the victualling office informed of the balance of cash in the treasurer's hands, applicable to their department, so as to enable them to judge whether to assign, or not, bills that may be due? *A.* As it is received by the Exchequer, it is or ought to be immediately certified to that board by the paymaster.——*Q.* Do you know whether such certificates have, in point of fact, always been regularly made? *A.* They have not been immediately made, because the money has been issued from the Exchequer in exchequer bills; which bills must go to market before the treasurer is in possession of the money.——*Q.* Has the Treasurer of the Navy any authority to issue orders to the victualling board? *A.* I believe not.——*Q.* Has the Treasurer of the Navy any discretion as to what bills shall be assigned, or not, on him? *A.* Certainly not; the money is entirely in the disposition of the commissioners of the victualling.——*Q.* Has he any other duties than to pay the bills assigned on him, as far as the balance standing in the Bank, under the head of "Victualling," enables him to do? *A.* No; except accounting for the money every fortnight.

Examination of DAVID ROBERTSON, *(an Attorney) taken 14th May.*

Q. Were you in partnership with the late Mr. Spottiswoode? *A.* I was.——*Q.* How many years have you been in business? *A.* Seventeen years his clerk; and partner about two years before he died.——*Q.* Do you know any thing of the instrument in your hand? *A.* I have some recollection of it.——*Q.* Do you recollect instructions being given for the preparation of that instrument? *A.* No.——*Q.* Do you know if that instrument was ever referred to counsel? *A.* Not to my knowledge.——*Q.* Is the clause to cancel and destroy, usual in instruments of that nature? *A.* I do *not know* that it is.——*Q.* Did you ever see it inserted in instruments of that nature before? *A.* I am not *aware* that I have.——*Q.* Is this an instrument in the Scotch form? *A.* It has the forms that are necessary in both countries.——*Q.* Does such a clause occur in Scotch instruments of release? *A.* I do *not think that it does;* I do not know that the clauses of Scotch releases are of a fixed nature.——*Q.* Have you been in the custom of seeing Scotch instruments of releases? *A.* They occur from time to time, but not very frequently here.——*Q.* In any Scotch instrument of the same kind you have seen, did you ever see such a clause? *A.* I cannot *venture to say* whether I have or have not.——*Q.* Did you ever draw a Scotch instrument of release? *A.* Yes.——*Q.* In such draft did you ever insert such a clause? *A.* Not *that I recollect;* in general releases of accounts betwixt landlord and steward in Scotland, it is the usual practice for the steward to deliver up the vouchers when the releases are signed.——*Q.* Is it usual to deliver up the account books also? *A.* I *believe* not.

Examination of CHARLES INNIS, *(an Attorney, &c. in Scotland) taken 17th May.*

Q. What is your situation in Scotland? *A.* Writer to the signet.——*Q.* What are the duties of that situation? *A.* I act as solicitor, attorney, and conveyancer.——*Q.* Is it usual, in settling accounts between parties in Scotland, mutually to deliver up or destroy the vouchers or documents upon which such settlement takes place? *A.* It is usual mutually to deliver up the vouchers, but *not to destroy.*——*Q.* Is it usual in any release that takes place between the parties upon such settlement, to refer in the body of the release, to the vouchers so delivered up or destroyed? *A.* The release generally bears, that the vouchers have been mutually delivered up, but nothing said about *destroying.*——*Q.* Have you seen a clause of the nature of that contained in the release now in your hand? *A.* I have seen a clause bearing that the vouchers have been mutually delivered up, but I never saw one by which it was agreed mutually *to cancel and destroy* the vouchers.——*Q.* For what legal purpose is a reference in releases introduced to the vouchers having been mutually delivered up? *A.* I believe it is more owing to the anxiety of parties than necessary in itself.—*Q.* Is it to make the release supersede in point of legal effect all preceding instruments? *A.* I should think so.——*Q.* Supposing a release to be executed between parties at the time remote from each other, is it unusual, according to the practice of Scotland, to covenant that that shall be done by the parties, namely, that all vouchers should be delivered up or destroyed which is referred to in releases as actually done by parties settling accounts on the spot together? *A.* In the case put, there is generally an obligation inserted in the release or discharge, obliging the parties afterwards mutually to deliver up the vouchers.——*Q.* Under the term vouchers, do you mean to comprehend account books kept by the parties? *A.* I do not.——*Q.* Did you ever know an instance where, upon the settlement of accounts between parties, account books have been delivered up or destroyed by agreement specified? *A.* I *never did.*——*Q.* Did you ever know an instance where an agent for several parties having kept the accounts of all those parties in one general book, upon the settlement of his account with one of his principals, had either delivered up such general account book to that one principal, or by agreement with that one principal, had destroyed it? *A.* I *never did.*——*Q.* You say you have seen a clause inserted in a release or releases, drawn according to the Scotch form, in which it is agreed to deliver up vouchers on both sides; in the course of your business do you usually draw them with such clauses? *A.* I generally do.——*Q.* Would not a release be to all intents and purposes as binding upon the parties without such clause, and would not such release continue to be binding, supposing the existence of all the vouchers for the accounts to which such release referred? *A.* I think it would.——*Q.* Is the release in your hand in the Scotch form? *A.* It appears to me to be partly in the English and partly in the Scotch form.——*Q.* You have stated that you wished to add to your evidence, given before this committee, to the words "I "never did," the following words: "On "recollection, I have known some instance

" of a *factor* or *steward* delivering up his " account books to his employer;" do you mean thereby to state that you have known account books kept by an agent, with several employers, to have been delivered up to *any one* of his employers, on the settlement of his account with such employer? *A.* I do not.

Examination of LORD HARROWBY, *(late Treasurer of the Navy and one of the King's* MOST HONOURABLE *Privy Council) taken on the 11th of May.*

Q. When did your lordship become Treasurer of the Navy? *A.* In June or July, 1800.——*Q.* On coming into office, or at any time after, did you discover that irregularities in the payment of public money had taken place in that office, and were then practised? *A.* As this office was regulated by a variety of acts of parliament which had been brought in by my immediate predecessor, and, as I had been myself a member of the committee of the House of Commons, appointed in 1797 to make inquiries respecting various public offices, *which committee had not discovered or reported any irregularity in the conduct of that particular office*, I had *no reason whatever to suppose* that any irregularities existed; at a subsequent period, but at what period I *am at present unable to recollect*, the particular practice to which I imagine the question alludes was brought to my notice.——*Q.* In what manner was your notice called to that practice? *A.* I really *cannot at this distance of time state* with any accuracy.——*Q.* Will you be so good as to state the practice? *A.* The practice, *as I understood it*, was this: instead of drawing money out of the Bank for each individual payment, or drawing it into the hands of the cashiers to be placed in the iron chest, or to be sent to the clerks of the out-ports, to be paid afterwards to such persons as had demands for naval service, sums of money were drawn by the paymaster from the Bank to the house of Messrs. Coutts, day by day, or more frequently, as they were likely to be wanted, and were distributed from the house of Messrs. Coutts by the orders of Mr. Trotter, either to the different cashiers, or to the different individuals to whom money was due.——*Q.* Did you understand the practice to have prevailed long?——*A.* When I first expressed some *doubts* concerning it, I was informed that the practice had began in 1786; as I had learnt that the act of 1785 had not been carried fully into execution till the beginning of the subsequent year, I imagined that the practice above-mentioned was in fact coeval with the act itself, and I did not know till I was informed by the Naval Commissioners, that any period had existed, however short, between the execution of that act and the commencement of the practice.——*Q.* Had the practice continued, without interruption, from the period of January 1786 to the period of your discovery of it? *A.* I know nothing to the contrary.——*Q.* Did the practice appear to you irregular, and contrary to law? *A.* As the practice of drawing money from the Bank into the hands of the different cashiers, for the purpose of subsequent distribution, had been stated by the Commissioners of Enquiry in 1782 to be absolutely necessary, which practice was perhaps hardly justifiable according to the strict letter of the act that was passed pursuant to their suggestions, and which practice, nevertheless, it was impossible to suppose that act was intended to prohibit, it did not *immediately appear to me* that the practice of drawing money out of the Bank into the hands of a private banker, if carried on *bonâ fide* for the same purposes of official convenience, and for those only, was necessarily illegal or unjustifiable; I *felt* it however to be a *considerable* objection to the practice, that it was in fact a substitution by the authority of the Treasurer of the Navy, for however short a time, of the security of a private banking-house, however respectable, in the room of the security of the Bank, or of the clerks of his own office; and I was sensible that this practice, in common with that of placing sums of money in the hands of the cashiers, or of the clerks at the out-ports, or even in the iron chest of the office, was in some degree liable to abuse, undoubtedly in a greater degree than the practices last referred to.——*Q.* Did you discover that abuse had arisen out of this practice? *A.* I did not.——*Q.* Were you ever informed, or had you ever reason to believe that the public money had, in consequence of this practice, been used to purposes of private emolument? *A.* I was undoubtedly aware that the habitual passage of considerable sums through the hands of a private banker, for however short a time each particular sum might remain upon his books, must be some advantage to the general concerns of the house, but I had no reason whatever to suspect, nor did I in fact suspect that any sums of money, after being drawn by Mr. Trotter from the Bank, for naval services, and placed in the hands of Messrs. Coutts, were subsequently drawn from that house for any purposes whatsoever, except the naval services for which they were originally drawn.——*Q.* Did you ever

communicate to the present Chancellor of the Exchequer the irregularity you had discovered? *A.* It is *difficult* for me, at this distance of time, *to recollect* every incidental conversation I may have had with the Chancellor of the Exchequer; the only conversation which I recollect having had with him on that subject, while I was in office, was, I believe, a short time before or after my visit to the Bank, which was *subsequent to Mr. Pitt's leaving office*, and the object of which is stated in my evidence before the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry; the steps I did take will appear in that evidence, to which I beg leave to refer.——*Q.* Do you recollect the terms, or the substance of the conversation that passed between you and Mr. Pitt? *A.* I only recollect very generally, that I mentioned to him the nature of the practice, with the reasons which led me *to believe* it to be *irregular*, and that I stated my *intention* of changing it; and as far as I can remember, Mr. Pitt *appeared* to agree with me in opinion, that it was desirable it should be changed. I had a subsequent conversation with Mr. Pitt, when we were *both out of office*, in the autumn 1802; the only thing which I recollect, is that the name of Mr. Coutts Trotter occurred in that conversation, and that I mentioned to Mr. Pitt that I thought it not improbable that either the circumstance of the naval money passing in part through the hands of the house of Coutts, to which I found that he belonged, might have led to his introduction into that house, or that the circumstance of his being a partner in it might have led to the selection of that house for that purpose; I meant this with a reference to advantage derived to the general concerns of a banking-house necessarily arising from the nature of their business, however cautiously conducted, and not from having any reason to believe that the naval money was used for the benefit of Mr. Alexander Trotter; I had the less reason to suspect it, as his salary had been increased, I think, in May 1800, from 500*l.* a year to 800*l.* on account of its inadequacy to the importance of his office.

OBSERVATIONS
ON THE FOREGOING EVIDENCE.

To have published the foregoing evidence, without making any observation at all on it, might, with some few persons, have subjected me to a charge of having, upon a subject of the greatest importance, discovered an indifference in the public cause; yet, so full is my conviction, that, in the opinions of all intelligent and honest men, the evidence alone is quite sufficient to the forming of a just decision as to the conduct of the parties accused, that I certainly should not have encumbered the inquiry with any comment of mine, had it not been so loudly and so provokingly called for by the writers in the ministerial newspapers. These gentlemen, in their desperate zeal to defend Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt, seem to have entirely forgotten what is due to the public as well as to their adversaries. They were, apparently at least, become somewhat more reasonable previously to the publication of the report of the Select Committee; but now, like an American lawyer reanimated by a refreshing fee, they have broken forth with more indecency, fury, and virulence than ever: by seven devils, each of them worse than the former, they seem to be possessed; and it is, we may fear, but too evident, that their last end will be worse than the first. To take serious notice of the effusions of such writers does, at first sight, appear to be unnecessary; but, when we consider, that they utter the sentiments of the close friends of the parties upon whose conduct we are sitting in judgment; when we consider that they are the professed defenders of those parties; and, when to these considerations is added the interesting reflection, that their writings are, at once cause and effect, leading to and proceeding from corruption, drawing present reward from the defence of past crimes, and, by encouraging a continuance of such crimes, providing the means of reward for the future; when we consider them in this light, they command our attention, and we are no more justified in contemptuously turning our back on them, than a judge would be justified in turning from the trial of a loathsome malefactor.—— There is one observation which applies generally to the conduct of all these writers, and that is, that the moment the report of the Select Committee appeared, they began to shout victory. Some of them went so far as to assert, that Lord Melville and even Mr. Trotter were now "proved to be entirely "innocent;" hints were thrown out, that the former might soon be expected to be re-instated in office; and, as to Mr. Pitt, it was said in so many words, that "the House "of Commons would do an act of injustice "if they refused to vote him their *thanks* "for his conduct." Such, unpardonably insulting as it is to the understanding and integrity of the nation and more especially of the House of Commons; almost exactly such was, as the public will recollect, their language relative to the conduct of Lord Melville and Mr. Trotter, when the Tenth Report first made its appearance. It is not

unamusing, and it is very useful, to bear in mind, the variation in their tone at the several successive stages of the proceedings against Lord Melville. At first, both he and Mr. Trotter were "perfectly innocent;" and though there had, indeed, been some little "irregularity," yet as it was for the public good, Lord Melville was to blame only because he had not the precaution to obtain a "bill of indemnity," which, therefore, they suggested the propriety of his obtaining now. Finding, however, that the facts of the Tenth Report made, upon the public mind, an impression not to be weakened by assertions like these, they began to confess that Lord Melville had connived at a breach of the law in behalf of Mr. Trotter; but, they insisted, that his Lordship had been deceived by Mr. Trotter, and that he himself had never thought of putting a farthing of the profits in his pocket, upon which last point they endeavoured to make the whole question revolve. When, therefore, his letter to the Commissioners was brought forward by Mr. Pitt, they congratulated their readers, actually *congratulated* them, on the "complete justification of the noble Lord," and in the disappointment of the opposition, who, they said, were now foiled in their views of "depriving Mr. Pitt of so able and upright "a coadjutor." The vote of censure lowered their tone till the motion of Mr. Whitbread for an address to the King to remove Lord Melville from the privy council was rejected by the House; but that rejection, that retrogade step, was the signal for their setting up the cry of persecution; "enough "had been done;" the people and parliament, "upon a *dispassionate* view of the "matter, were returning towards moderation." Their exultation at the result of the discussions, between the vote of censure and the 6th of May, will be well remembered; but, when they found, that, notwithstanding those symptoms of "a return to "moderation," Mr. Pitt himself had advised the dismission of Lord Melville from the privy council for fear the House of Commons should carry such advice to the throne, they appear to have thought it high time to quit Lord Melville and to betake them to their last remaining hold, Mr. Pitt, respecting whose conduct, they have now assumed precisely the same tone that they held with regard to Lord Melville upon his being first openly accused.——At every stage of the proceedings, these gentlemen have, it will be observed, endeavoured to give to the question the character of *party*; to make the people believe, that were it not for the sake of *turning out* the ministers and getting into their places, no proceedings *at all* would have taken place against Lord Melville; in short, to represent the main concern of all the leading men in parliament, and, indeed of the whole parliament, to be a scramble for office, or, as the phrase is, for the loaves and fishes. This representation, so exactly what the Jacobins, with Paine at their head, have been constantly holding up to the people, and which the people, should justice be finally eluded, will, perhaps, be but too likely to take for a reality, is now pressed forward upon us with greater zeal than ever. "Whatever," says the Oracle of the 6th instant, "be the *fate* of Lord Melville, the "conduct and character of Mr. Pitt remain "as pure and unsullied *as ever*." [An opinion to which thousands and hundreds of thousands will *now* readily subscribe.] "It is this "*important fact* which checks the ambition "of Messrs. Fox and Grey; it is this *important fact* which maddens their disappointment, and heightens their fury; it "is the *important fact* that Mr. Pitt will "*not retire from office* to make room for a "desperate faction, which disturbs their "minds, and reduces them to the extremity of distress and despair. No wonder, "therefore, that the Opposition should be "unbounded in expressions of indignation; "no wonder, therefore, that in the height "of their rage they should move an impeachment against Lord Melville, and "menace Mr. Pitt with the odium of their "tremendous resolutions. As for Mr. Pitt, "no defence is necessary on his part; for "had he acted differently on the occasion of "the 40,000*l.* loan to Messrs. Boyd and "Benfield, he would indeed have acted criminally. He deserves the thanks of the "country for thus saving public credit from "the serious shock with which it was "threatened. Messrs. Fox and Grey would, "perhaps, readily acknowledge this truth; "but they cannot pardon Mr. Pitt for *keeping them longer from office*. When the "fates had deprived Mr. Pitt of the powerful co-operation of Lord Grenville, it was "thought that the minister could not form "an administration, because, with the exception of Lord Melville, they reported "him without any man of talents. An administration was formed of the same materials *which Opposition had been constantly ridiculing*. Another precious opportunity presented itself; the fall of Lord Melville. Their fondest hopes were now about to be confirmed. Deprive Mr. Pitt, they said, of Lord Melville, and his ruin is certain. Such a deprivation is certainly a very serious loss; but Mr. Pitt *still*

"*remains firm and unshaken.* The inquiry "has redounded to his *honour*, and his *fame* "*is increasing daily.*" What! *increasing?* And increasing *daily*, too? The fame of Mr. Pitt *increase?* This, if true, is a serious truth for that gentleman, especially when he adverts to the source whence it proceeds. It must indeed be highly gratifying to Mr. Pitt to find that his character's remaining "*pure* "and *unsullied*" is, and by his defenders too, regarded as an "*important fact.*"——When men fly off from their subject, when they are continually rambling into extraneous matter, and are calling in the aid of premises and conclusions unconnected with the question before them, you may be certain, not only that their cause is bad, but that they themselves are fully convinced of the fact. When, therefore, in an attempt to defend the conduct of Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt in misapplying, or conniving at the misapplication of, the public money, you find yourself led into a censure of the opposition of Mr. Fox to the last or the present war with France; when you are asked what would be the measures, which that gentleman, if minister, would pursue with regard to the enemy; when you see the topic of *coalition* introduced, where you would naturally look for arguments to invalidate a charge of *peculation*; when this is the case, you may be sure that the defence is a desperate cause, and that the writer appeals to your passions and your prejudices merely because he dares not appeal to your reason and your justice. It is possible, though not very likely, that greater injury and greater dishonour might have arisen from peace with republican France than from wars *such as Mr. Pitt's*; and, as it is not quite impossible to find a man to believe, that Mr. Fox, if minister, would conduct the present war in such a manner as to render us more despicable in the eyes of the enemy than we have been rendered by Mr. Pitt, so there is a bare possibility of finding some one to think, that Mr. Pitt may coalesce with whomsoever he pleases, without any deviation from the rules of political rectitude; that, after opposing Mr. Dundas and Mr. Eden, he might coalesce with them; that he might afterwards coalesce with the Portland party; that he might then coalesce with Mr. Fox for the purpose of turning out the Addingtons, whom he had introduced with the recommendation of the highest capacity, and whom he turned out branded with the charge of "*incapacity* and *imbe*-"*cillity*;" and that, finally, he might coalesce with these very Addingtons: there is a bare possibility of finding some one to think, or, at least, to pretend to think, that all this is perfectly justifiable in Mr. Pitt, while, if aimed against his power, he has a right to consider the co-operation of any two persons in the world, who have ever disagreed in their lives, as an act of inconsistency proceeding from a total want of principle; but, if even such a mortal as this were to be found, it would, I think, be impossible to persuade him, that Mr. Fox's opposition to the late war, that his present opinions as to the continuation or the manner of conducting hostilities, or, that his having formed a coalition with gentlemen to whom he was formerly opposed, has any thing to do with the charges against Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt. Such a man may think that all these are grounds of objection to Mr. Fox; but still he must ask himself, what have they to do here? What, in the name of common sense, have they to do with a defence against charges respecting the disposition of the public money by Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt? The truth, is, that, at every step, these advocates perceive the badness of their cause; and the language of their hearts is simply this: 'we must 'divert the attention of the people; we 'must revive the most powerful prejudices 'of those who have been long accustomed 'to support our clients against the men who 'are now their immediate accusers; we 'must, at whatever risk to the reputation 'of parliament and to the safety of the 'constitution, persuade the people that this 'is a party question; and thus shall we 'confuse and bewilder their minds, blunt 'the edge of their indignation, and prevent 'the execution of that justice which is de-'manded by the merits of the case.' That they will succeed, and that indeed they have already succeeded, to a certain degree, is evident enough; but, the effect of their success will, I am persuaded, be only temporary. As to its main object, the preserving of the power of Mr. Pitt, it must completely fail; for, to suppose that that power could be of any long duration, after perusing the evidence, upon which we are now about to comment, would be to impute to a decided majority of the nation, such a total want of honourable sentiments and even of common honesty, such a proneness to base submission, as would render the faculty of ruling over them unworthy of the name of *power*, and would degrade the office of prime minister of England to a level with that of a whipper-in or a swineherd.

The FIRST of the three heads, as stated in the preface to the Evidence, relates to *Lord Melville's participation in the profits derived from the misapplication of the public money.* It will be remembered, that, if Mr.

Whitbread's motion had been carried, the Committee, by whom the above evidence was taken, would have been enabled to inquire into the whole of the matters connected with the application or employment of the naval money; but that, in consequence of the restriction proposed *by Mr. Pitt*, and finally carried, no inquiry could be made, except incidentally, respecting any of the facts tending to discover the nature of the transactions between Lord Melville and Mr. Trotter. Nevertheless, such facts have come out as prove beyond all contradiction, that Lord Melville did participate in the profits; for, it appears from the evidence of Mr. Trotter, 1. that there was a sum of 10,000*l.* of the public money, which Lord Melville held, *without interest*, for the whole sixteen years that Mr. Trotter was paymaster under him; 2. that there was a sum of 20,000*l.* one half of which was public money, advanced to Lord Melville by Mr. Trotter, and upon which *no interest* was paid; 3. that there was an account current advance to him of from 10 to 20,000*l.* upon which *no interest* was paid. On this latter account a very small balance was, now-and-then, in favour of Lord Melville, but, it appears, that no interest was ever paid *on either side*. There is no proof that the *principal* was ever paid back by Lord Melville, or by any person for him, *out of his own property*. Mr. Trotter says, it *was paid* back, but he gives no account of the time *when* it was paid; he remembers nothing of the *sources whence* it came, though he was Lord Melville's private agent as well as public deputy; and he affords not the slightest trace as to *the person or persons by whom* the re-payments, or any of them, were made; and, therefore, the conclusion is, that they came out of the profits of those speculations in the funds, which, in the hands of such a firm, could scarcely fail to prove uncommonly productive. This would have been easily ascertained, if the prudent parties had not taken care to *destroy their account books*, and all other written evidences relating to the transactions between them. This circumstance has been called "*suspicious*". It is not suspicious: it is proof of guilt: proof much stronger than that which many a man has been convicted upon in a court of justice. Lord Melville, in his letter, written to the Commissioners of Naval Inquiry previous to his examination, says (see p. 455)

"It is more than four years since I left the "office of Treasurer of the Navy. From "that time I never considered any one "paper or voucher that remained in my "hands as of the smallest use to myself or "any other person, and consequently, *being "often in the practice*, since I retired to "Scotland, of employing some time in "assorting my papers, and *destroying* those "that were *useless*, I am satisfied that there "does not exist any one material, by which "I could make up such an account as you "specify." Now, from this letter, who would not have imagined, that the destroying of these papers was rather a thing of *accident* than otherwise? Who would have imagined, that they had been destroyed in consequence of a deed, mutually made and ratified between him and Mr. Trotter, for the purpose of insuring the destruction of "all *vouchers* or other *memorandums* and "*writings*, that at any time heretofore may "have existed, passed, or been interchanged "between them relative to the said ac-"counts, and the different items and arti-"cles of which the said accounts are com-"posed or consist?" Who would have imagined that the *destroying*, which his lordship spoke of in his letter above quoted was of this general and sweeping nature? If, as Mr. Trotter wished to make it be believed, there had been no *criminal intention* in the deed of release, or of *destruction*, as it ought to be called, how came Lord Melville to disguise the fact from the Naval Commissioners? How came he not to tell them, at once, that all the papers and accounts had been destroyed by agreement? It was so natural for him to have said this, if he had not been conscious of some guilty intention. Mark the *time*, too, when this solemn agreement was made. It was not immediately after Lord Melville left the treasurership of the navy; yet, that is the time, if ever, that a man might be expected to think of such a step. It was not when Mr. Trotter and he finally closed all accounts between them; for Mr. Trotter continued to be his private agent long afterwards, and does so continue to this hour, perhaps. It was not, as Mr. Trotter pretends, at the time when Lord Melville was retiring to live in Scotland; for he left London in the spring of 1802, and the deed, the destructive deed, was not executed till the month of February, 1803. It was at none of these epochs; but, it was *just after Lord Melville, who was then in Scotland, must have received intelligence, that an act had been passed constituting a board of commissioners to inquire into the abuses and frauds committed by persons in the several offices belonging to the navy*. This was the time at which it entered into the minds of Lord Melville and his worthy paymaster to destroy, nay, to insure the destruction, of all the books and papers relating to transactions between them; the very time at which, had

all been honourable and honest, they would have been hunting up, and carefully preserving, every scrap of paper appertaining to any matters at all connected with their lately occupied offices. The deed of destruction was, it appears, executed by Lord Melville, in Scotland, on the 18th of February, 1803, and by Mr. Trotter, in London, on the 23d of the same month. Why take all this trouble in sending the deed backward and forward so many miles? Why such haste? After suffering the "*useless*" vouchers to exist for two years and a half, why such sudden haste to destroy them; especially as Lord Melville came up to London in person in about a month after executing the deed, that is to say, in March, 1803, as we all recollect, to carry on the memorable negotiation for place; which was, in fact, a negotiation for *turning out Lord St. Vincent*, which negotiation, too, it is now not uninteresting to remember, did, according to the account of both the Pitts and the Addingtons, *originate with Lord Melville!* At only touching this point, what rays of light break in upon us, in every direction! All the mysterious occurrences of March and April, 1803, are at once cleared up. We now see the cause of Lord Melville's sudden return from Scotland; his journeys to Walmer Castle and to Sir Charles Middleton; while rumours were afloat of his being about *to supplant Lord St. Vincent at the Admiralty*, and of Lord St. Vincent's *refusing to go out*, though strongly urged thereto *by Mr. Addington*. ——That Lord Melville participated with Mr. Trotter in the advantage derived from the illegal use of the navy money is now past a doubt, notwithstanding all the declarations of himself and Mr. Pitt to the contrary. The *extent* only remains to be proved, and to render this proof difficult or impossible, the parties have destroyed books, memorandums, vouchers, and documents of every kind. I defy charity itself to suggest a plausible reason for this complete destruction, except the consciousness of guilt and the fear of discovery; the fear that one of the parties had that the other might impeach him. When people settle an account current, and grant mutual releases, it is common to deliver up the vouchers, and to destroy them as useless; but, to destroy the *account itself*, the books in which it stood, and every trace of the transactions of the parties, never was done, or thought of, by innocent men. Lord Melville's answers before the Commissioners, with respect to a participation with Trotter, are now shown to have been evasive and equivocal, if not absolutely false; but, in his *letter*, his famous letter to the Board of Commissioners, his letter, so exultingly brought before the House of Commons by Mr. Pitt, in that letter he positively states, that, previous to Trotter's paymastership, he never derived any profit from the use of the naval money; and yet it now appears, that, *before* Trotter's time, he had taken 10,000*l.* of the public money and kept it without interest. He may now, perhaps, think it fortunate, that, when he offered to *swear*, the commissioners did not take him at his word.—— That Lord Melville has repaid the *principal* of the navy money, which he applied to his use, has not been proved. Mr. Trotter no where says that he has. And, if he had, there would then have been no reason for the destruction of books and papers. He knew that Trotter was making great gains by the public money; and, though the Right Honourable and Noble person might not have appropriated to himself any precise proportion of those gains, he took considerable sums of money from Trotter, whenever he had occasion for them. If the money was returned, why not tell us *when* and *how*. Though the papers and books are destroyed, there can be no difficulty in stating from what sources the money was derived which enabled Lord Melville to refund. And I ask any honest man, whether he thinks it possible, that Trotter should have *forgotten all about* the repayments, if those repayments had ever been made. Being asked, as to the 10,000*l.* of the public money, which Lord Melville kept in his hands from the time that Trotter became paymaster; being asked, as to this sum, "Can you recollect *any thing* "about the repayment of the specific sum of "10,000*l.* which, at your commencing pay-"master, Lord Melville acknowledged to "you, that he owed to the public?" He answers: "*I do not.*" The result, therefore, is, that there is the strongest presumptive proof, that Lord Melville pocketed both principal and interest of all the sums at different times advanced to him, by Trotter, out of the public money. This is an opinion that every unbiased man must form from a perusal of the foregoing evidence, taken into view with the Tenth Report of the Naval Commissioners; this is the impression produced and left upon the mind; and this impression no speeches and no votes will remove.

The SECOND head relates to the conduct of Mr. Pitt in conniving at the withdrawing of naval money from the Bank of England, in direct violation of the law, for the purpose of lending it to two loan-jobbers, named Boyd and Benfield. This transaction took place in or about the month of October,

1796 (for here also, there are *no books or memorandums)*, and the sum was 40,000 l. The story they tell is this: that, at the time above-mentioned, Boyd and Benfield were so hard pressed for money, that they were unable to make good an instalment upon a loan to government, unless somebody would lend them 40,000 l. Upon the discovery of which Mr. Dundas generously offered to accommodate them with 40,000 l. of the public money, in which offer Mr. Pitt concurred. Boyd and Benfield accepted the offer, received the money, kept it for nearly a year, and then returned it, without, however, the payment of any *interest*. There is a long story, as the reader will see, of the Right Honourable Charles Long, about going to Lord Melville and meeting Mr. Boyd afterwards at the Treasury and taking securities or pawns from him and sending the said pawns to Lord Melville and having some conversation with Mr. Pitt touching the premises. There is, too, no very short story of Mr. Pitt himself about the *mischiefs* that would have arisen to the *public* from the failure of Boyd and Benfield; but, there is nothing said, and nothing can be said, to do away the fact, or to change its nature. From the evidence of Mr. Drummond, who was a partner of Boyd and Benfield, it appears that, with the pawns said to have been lodged with Lord Melville, the 40,000 l. could have been raised *elsewhere*; and, indeed, to talk of "*great public mischief*" to be apprehended from the want of 40,000 l. is something too contemptible to deserve serious notice. With the jews, the money dealers, that vile race of men, who, to save what *they* call *public credit*, but which, in fact, is neither more nor less than a system by which they live at their ease upon the labour of the poor and upon the estates of the nobility, the gentry, and the clergy; with this race of men, amongst whom but too many of the merchants may be included, any act, no matter how grossly illegal, how flagrantly corrupt, will be excused, and even applauded, if it be committed under the pretext of preserving *public credit*, in comparison with which the honour of their wives and daughters is something too trifling to mention. But, with men of other minds, and, in spite of the baleful influence of the jews and their like, let us hope, that a majority of our countrymen are men of other minds, the loan to Boyd and Benfield will admit of no palliation. Mr. Pitt knew that he was conniving at a breach of the law, a gross violation of a law which he had taken great merit to himself for causing to be passed; and, as to the *necessity* for it; as to the "*great public mischief*" that he thereby prevented; that excuse vanishes into air, when we perceive, from his own acknowledgment, that the loan was not of his own proposing, but that it *originated with Lord Melville*. But, if we were to allow, that Boyd and Benfield could have obtained the money no where else upon their pawns; if we were to allow that the Treasurer of the Navy kept the only pawn shop in London; and, if we were further to allow, that a failure occasioned by a want of 40,000 l. would have produced a "great public mischief;" if we were to allow all this, and almost as much more as even the Right Honourable Charles Long could ask us to allow, where shall we look for a satisfactory reason for the *secret* manner, in which the business was managed? It might, to use the words of that useful person Mr. George Glenny, relative to the *wind bills*, be necessary, for reasons too obvious to mention, "to *disguise the transaction from the eyes* "*of the public*;" but, Mr. Pitt disguised it from the eyes of the *cabinet*. Why was this? Is it possible to suggest an honourable motive for it? Let the reader take a moment to consider this question, and, if he be not a jew, or something very much like one, I know what his decision will be. Supposing, however, that the transaction was to be regarded as too "delicate" to be communicated even to the cabinet, and fit only for the bosoms of Lord Melville, Mr. Pitt, Mr. Long, Mr. Boyd, and the delicate Mr. Benfield; yet, some *record* of it should have been preserved, one would think. There was, indeed, no *destroying* of vouchers in this case, for, as it would appear, care was taken that none ever should exist! Finally, however, there remained no longer any pretext for secrecy upon the subject. The apprehension of the "*great public* "*mischief*" was gone off; and, as if to deprive Mr. Pitt of all excuse, Boyd and Benfield, verifying the old proverb that what comes over the back goes under the belly, wind up their affairs with a statute of bankruptcy. Why not make the matter known then? Why not come to parliament and ask a bill of indemnity for an act declared to be so necessary to the salvation of the state, but withal so notoriously illegal? What is Mr. Pitt's answer to this question? Why, that it did "not *occur* to him as "necessary!" And, will this answer satisfy the parliament? Will it satisfy the people? Will they not perceive, that it is by mere *accident* that any trace of this transaction has ever been discovered? Will they not perceive, that, from the first, it was evidently intended, that nobody but the parties themselves *should ever* come at

any knowledge of the matter? And will not the most ingenious man in existence find it very difficult to ascribe this intention to any honourable motive? ——Upon this point it is that the decision of the parliament will be important indeed; for, it appears to me, that, if Mr. Pitt's conduct, in this instance, escape censure; if it be not severely reprobated, a licence will be, by implication, henceforth granted to every minister, and every person entrusted with the public money, to dispose of that money in whatever way *he* may choose to regard as calculated to prevent "*public mischief.*" The parliament may, and, probably will, continue to pass *appropriation* laws, but the minister will *choose* in what cases they shall, or shall not, be *obeyed*. He may think, and, doubtless, he will think, that the most effectual way to prevent public mischief is to keep him in his place, in which opinion he will be joined by all his dependents; and, he must be a very dull man indeed, if the *means* of prevention do not readily present themselves to his mind. The low sneaking work of bribery will, indeed, be completely at an end: it will be entirely supplanted by the handsome and gracious act of a *loan without interest*. With the power of making such loans to *members of parliament* (as Boyd and Benfield were) without consultation even with the cabinet, without putting upon record, any where, any memorandum of the transaction, and with a *precedent for impunity in case of accidental detection*, what man, who has sense enough to count the hobnails at the Exchequer, need hereafter be afraid of losing his place as prime minister of England? To talk of the *urgency* or *peculiarity* of the case is perfect nonsense; for, if this precedent be established, the minister will be constituted the *judge*, and the *sole* judge of the necessity of lending the public money to individuals, and that, too, without interest. *Unequivocal censure*, therefore, or *complete justification*, must be pronounced. There is no middle course. It is impossible for us so to express our opinion as not to pronounce a clear and decided censure upon Mr. Pitt, without acknowledging that every prime minister, be he who he may, is, in spite of all laws to the contrary, at perfect liberty to lend the public money, (without making any *record* thereof) to individuals, when such loans are necessary to prevent public mischief, of which necessity *he is to be the sole judge*. I am aware, indeed, that, in objection to this argument, it may be observed, that I do not advert to the peculiar circumstance of the "accommodation" having, in this instance, been given by a *heaven-born* minister; by a person, whose political power arose out of his ten-thousand-times repeated professions of purity; who, for many years, spoke of little else than of reforming parliament, of cutting corruption up by the roots, of hunting out and punishing abuses in office, and of husbanding the public money to the last farthing. I am well aware that it will be insisted, that, to a person, so immaculate, may safely be allowed privileges, which it would be extremely unwise to trust in the hands of men of mere mortal origin; and that, for one of the Wicked to attempt to give "accommodations," to make loans of the public money to members of parliament, and especially *without interest*, would be a direct usurpation of the rights of the Saints. I am aware, that particular instances of Mr. Pitt's superior purity and of his anxious care of the public property will be pointed out to me. I know I shall be referred to those more than mortal strains, with which he began his oratorical career, by which he obtained that sublime appellation that placed him above all his predecessors as well as his contemporaries, and which either raised him above, or sunk the people of England beneath, the character of manhood. I shall be bidden to look back to the day when he first opened his lips in parliament; when he so earnestly besought his hearers to remember, that "it was their "immediate duty, as the Commons House "of Parliament, to guard the lives, the li-"berties and the *properties* of the people; "that the last obligation was the strongest; "that it was *more immediately incumbent* "upon them to guard the *properties*, be-"cause they were more liable to invasion, "by the *secret* and subtle attacks of *in-"fluence;* that it was an unaccountable "species of reasoning to talk of the *sum "being insignificant* in comparison to our "expenses, and that our expenses were so "enormous that it was ridiculous to attend "to little matters of account, as if, because "we had spent so many millions, thousands "were *beneath our consideration.*" From this dawn of heaven-descended purity, which broke in upon the benighted aisles of St. Stephen's on the 26th of February, 1781, I shall, doubtless, be led to his second public oration, which was made on the 31st of the following month, and in which he thus burst forth, upon the subject of abuses in the *expenditure of the public money*: "What is it "that gives the House of Commons its "importance? What but the power of the "purse? Every branch of the legislature "has something to distinguish it, and that "which at once gives the character and

" elevation of the Commons House of " Parliament, is, that they hold the " strings of the national purse, and are " entrusted with the great and *important* " power, first of *granting* the money, and " then of *correcting the expenditure* . . . " How humiliating, how miserable a picture " of parliamentary power is it now wished " to be exhibited! So then, all the power " of parliament, with respect to the alleviation of national burdens, the redress of " grievances, the reform of expence, the " economy, the system, the elucidation of " office, is sunk into a disgraceful negative! " One positive power, indeed remains; *the* " *odious power of taxing the people*, whenever the minister thinks proper. The " odious power of making them pay for his " *wild schemes* and *lavish corruption*. . . . . " I earnestly conjure the House to use their " own eyes, and to consult their own understandings; to return to a sense of their " duty to the people; to act like *honest* " independent members of parliament, and " no longer implicitly *pin their faith* " upon the sleeve of a minister, whose sole " object is to *deceive* and *mislead*, just as " best answers his purpose." After this, I am aware, I shall hear quoted, the report of his memorable speech of the 7th of May, 1782, when, in calling for a reform of parliament, he represented boroughs as "sources " of *corruption*; as giving rise to an inundation of *corrupt wealth*, and *corrupt* " *members*, who had no regard nor connection, either for or with the people " of this kingdom." Then though I have already heard of it again and again, I shall once more, in order to impress it on my memory, and to shake my belief as to even his own confessions relative to his conduct after the information of Mr. Raikes, be reminded of this his declaration on the 8th of March, 1785: " For *my part* I can see no reason " for passing over even the most *trifling abuses*, except laziness or pride; " and these are obstacles, which, I hope, " will never stand between *me* and my duty. " Nor can I conceive how, in the present " situation of this country, any person or " persons, to whom the care of its interests " are entrusted, can justify to themselves *to* " *omit any exertion*, that may tend, even in " *the most minute particular*, to promote " that economy, on which the recovery of " the state from its present depressed situation so much depends." I am aware, that, of all this, and of much more that might be referred to, I shall be reminded; and, those who think, that these former professions of Mr. Pitt ought to make them now disbelieve the evidence of their own senses, may probably think themselves justified in excusing, in his conduct, that which always has been, and is to be, regarded as highly criminal in any other man; but, those, who think, and I confess myself to be one of that number, that, when the practice of a man is found to be directly at variance with his solemnly promulgated and frequently repeated professions, the circumstance is calculated rather to increase distrust than to re-establish confidence; those, who, while they disbelieve the facts as I do, allow for argument's sake, that there has *no actual public loss* of money arisen from the loan to Boyd and Benfield, that the loan was *really* necessary to prevent a great public mischief, and who contemplate, in the transaction, nothing but a secret accomodation, for whatever purpose, from a minister, to members of parliament, out of the public money; those who perceive, that if we once give a sanction to an act like this, to a lending of the public money by the minister, without his consulting either the parliament or the cabinet, and without any other ground of justification when the matter is *by accident* found out, than a necessity, of which he himself is *the sole judge*; those who perceive, that, if we once sanction, either expressly or tacitly, an act like this, there is, in reality, no longer any check upon him, that *every* merchant and banker, whether a member of parliament or not, may be accommodated in his turn, that the parliamentary power of the purse is, in fact, at an end, and that the minister is, as to all practical purposes, the despotic ruler of the country; all those who see the matter in this light, and who prefer the honour of parliament and the durability of the constitution to the gratification of their private interests and their passions, will I am persuaded, whatever their feelings may be with regard to the person of Mr. Pitt, acknowledge the necessity of a decided censure upon his conduct.——[The THIRD head must be postponed to my next. It will, of course, embrace, incidentally, some remarks upon the conduct of LORD HARROWBY and Mr. BRAGGE as well as Mr. RAIKES.]

*** The IIId. Vol. of the PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES, contains all the first TEN REPORTS of the Naval Commissioners.

ERATUM in the last No. p. 817 l. 4. for *as* read *we are*.

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, and published by R. Bagshaw, Bow-Street, Covent Garden, where former Numbers may be had; sold also by J. Budd, Crown and Mitre, Pall-Mall.